THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXIII OCTOBER, 1936 No. 196

EDITORIAL

A recent visit to Germany, which was made much more instructive by the willing co-operation of a considerable number of German friends, has made it possible to form certain impressions of the state of affairs in that country. It is manifest that the people in general are happy and hopeful, and the Nazi *régime* seems to have had a wholesome effect on life. Germans are filled with a profound sense of relief. They feel that they have been delivered in three short years from a state of misery and almost total ruin. They have laid the foundations of what looks like economic stability, and even prosperity, but that is not all. There is a moral satisfaction, something which cannot fairly be dismissed as complacency, though it has elements of that in it, which is quite unmistakable. They are sure that they are on the right road. Their march along this road is strictly regimented. Public opinion, political pressure and economic necessity all combine to point in the same direction. The situation of a middle-aged paterfamilias, who has lost the whole of what capital he ever possessed and has only his salary and his expectation of a State pension, undoubtedly contains incentives to orthodoxy. And in effect orthodoxy, together with at least the appearance of great enthusiasm, has been achieved. Thought itself is free, as of course it must be, but resistance to the *régime* is not allowed. The Germans, however, are accustomed to be disciplined, and such is their mystic faith in their leader that many of them seem hardly conscious of the strictness of the order under which they live. We all know that strict discipline which is willingly accepted may give a happy sense of freedom to fulfil a vocation. This is naturally most conspicuous in the young. Some of the older defenders of the new order have rather the air of making a case. The younger are overflowing with enthusiasm.

Politically, the dominating thought is opposition to Bolshevism. If you ask why, you are told that Russian Bolshevism means two things. One is a way in which the Russians choose to organize their own nation. With that the Germans have no concern. The other is an aggressive political and cultural force which desires to penetrate the world. That they hate and fear. Nothing would give them so much satisfaction as to see Great Britain line up with Germany on the anti-Communist front. There is a wistful tendency to look to England for sympathy on the ground of common blood. When they hear that Scots and Welsh have just as much sympathy for Germany as the English, they are pleased but surprised. They are surprised, because "blood and race" means so much to modern Germany. Everything is "national." The word "international" is often heard, and internationalism is by no means repudiated, but it sometimes seems to have been dragged in at the end of an argument in order to impress the foreigner. The usual argument is, "In this way we Germans, rejecting the old abstraction of a humanity which could be thought of as everywhere the same, have determined to develop the human strength (*Kraft*, not *Macht*), which God has given us in our own community (*Volk*) and on our own soil." Then, it is added, eagerly but not always quite convincingly, "we shall become a better member of the family of nations."

What is the bearing of religion on all this, or of all this on religion? The official religion of the Nazi party is "Positive Christianity." This is an undenominational minimum, a sort of Boy Scout religion, "Trust in God, and care for your neighbour." It need hardly be said that, while this is more than some Germans have been accustomed to believe, there are very many, both Catholic and Protestant, for whom it is not nearly enough. But part of the reason for the choice of the term was that it enabled "Negative Christianity" to be set in a bad light. Advantage has been taken of this for anti-Semitic purposes. We were told that Herr Rosenberg's fantastic mythology, with its definite repudiation of Theism and of the Old Testament and even of St. Paul, its exaltation of "blood and race" as the source of supreme spiritual value, and its recourse to the old Nordic divinities, though it has had a large sale, is not to be taken too seriously. Nevertheless, quite apart from actual anti-Semitism, there is no doubt that Nazism is a religion, that Hitler is to many a sort of Messianic figure, and that many "German-Christians" put their Germanism first and their Christianity second. This has obviously some very sinister theological and political possibilities.

The Churches have all suffered, and have all gained. They have gained, as Christianity always gains under persecution, in faith and courage and intensity. They have suffered, in that their youth-movements have been either suppressed or discouraged by authority, and many obstacles have been placed in their way, and it appears that the secular authorities are not above listening to telephone conversations or adopting other means of listening in to what is said in private. The Roman Catholics claim to be as good Germans as any, to be anti-Communist, and to be entitled to preach and practise their whole faith. They seem to be hindered, but hardly to the point of what may be called persecution. Among the Protestants there are various grades. Some are disposed to accept a good deal of the German *Muthos*, and to think that it does not matter. Others stand boldly out for "real Christianity." Even among those there are differences. Some, with the Lutheran theological tradition and the Lutheran habit of co-operation with the State, are disposed to work with the newly-formed Church Committees, appointed "to restore order in the Church," until and unless it should be found impossible. Others, in theology more Calvinistic and, it may be added, more Fundamentalist and ecclesiastically more Nonconformist, stand away from all contacts with officialdom. It should be noted that none of them have any desire to take any part in "politics." Their Gospel has been a personal Gospel, and *Christliche Socialismus* is very unlike what, in this country, we call Christian Socialism. What they are demanding is not much more than the right to exist, and to assemble for the worship of God on Sunday, and to administer their own affairs, and even that is found hard to secure.

The savage side of Nazism was of course not apparent to the visitor. Kind-hearted Germans, when challenged about their treatment of the Jews, would explain that it was an unfortunate necessity, there were too many Jews in Germany; and that their influence on education, on the theatre, on the cinema, on literature and journalism was bad. A purge was necessary. No doubt there were some good Jews, but as the stand was made on grounds of race, some hardship could not be avoided. Of the cruelties and indignities inflicted on Jews, and of the malicious propaganda still published, the best Germans seemed heartily ashamed. Other questions about the treatment of Christian-Jews, and the education of their children, were parried. Many Germans seem to know little of what is done in their country. The press is not free, and the sort of thing that they hear is that there has been some un-

fortunate difficulty or disturbance, and that authority was compelled to put it down with a strong hand.

Of what is commonly meant in England by tolerance they have not much notion, and for it they have but little respect. It was startling to hear from a Professor sentiments which we commonly associate with simple-minded old ladies. "Is it not a fact that most European biologists are disposed to attach much less importance to race than is the custom in Nazi Germany?" "Is it not the fact that most psychologists, while they are willing to allow that the conscious level is affected by race, nevertheless believe that the subconscious has a more universal character?" "Yes, it is the fact, but our biology and our psychology do not say that." With this curious obscurantism, and with sinister things in the background, there is nevertheless much genuine and very attractive eagerness. They feel themselves to be living in the morning of a new day. The community-sense is strong, and though it is possible that the class-war has only been postponed, the relations between classes seem to be good. These remarks are hasty, but it happens that they are the fruit of rather unusual opportunities, not all of the same kind.

It was impossible, owing to circumstances, last month to comment on Dr. Major's friendly protest against being classed with the Pelagians, though it seems that there is a sense in which he readily admits it. We had no desire to charge him with denying the need of grace, and if we had the appearance of doing so, we ask his pardon. Only it seemed that he—like other Modernists—was inclined to begin at the human end, and make a certain type of twentieth century *homo sapiens* the measure of all things. He would, perhaps, reply that his human sapience is the instrument that has been given him to judge withal. True, but the instrument, in the right hands and used aright, is surely a larger and more deeply effective instrument than appears at first sight. A Christian, a Catholic, is fortified. The water that has flowed under the bridge has not simply run off and been wasted. It has been harnessed to the making of a spiritual current which corrects our modern superficialisms. Here seems to be a difference between the Catholic and the Modernist thinker. Not that the Modernist would deny in terms his debt to the past and to his environment. But the Catholic is more aware of it.

The death of Charles Harris is a sad loss to the cause for which this journal stands. He was a zealous and efficient parish priest, learned, a man of both vision and pertinacity. He set himself many years ago to produce and to further the production of Catholic literature which would bear critical examination. He made valuable researches in connection with the history of unction and the judicial powers of Convocation, and his *Pro Fide*, though hardly original, was remarkably comprehensive. But his chief work was to enlist the co-operation of others. He determined to persuade the Church Union (at that time the English Church Union) to father a whole series of superficially dangerous but really most wholesome productions. It is rumoured that not a few heads were shaken at first, but those which were not shaken (as the Epistle to the Hebrews says of things other than heads) remained, and were all the better for the experience. Harris succeeded because he was so sure that he was right, and he would never let go. The publication of books like the *Bible Commentary*, *Essays Catholic and Critical*, *Liturgy and Worship*, *Northern Catholicism*, has proved the soundness of his judgment. He was, in his later years, eagerly engaged in promoting the issue of a great Encyclopædia, to which we had all promised to contribute. It was to contain eight volumes, and was to be international, interconfessional, under Anglican editorship. Harris leaves no one behind him who has enough drive and could make enough time to carry the ambitious project into execution. He will be much missed in the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation, where he spoke perhaps rather too often, but he was so eager that occasional irritation was lost in continual respect. R.I.P.

BOSSUET AS A PREACHER

JACQUES BENIGNE BOSSUET was a preacher, a theologian, a philosopher, a historian, a champion of the Gallican Church, a formidable controversialist, a patient and sympathetic confessor, and a master of French prose. But it is only of the preacher that I propose to speak here. He was born at Dijon on September 27, 1627, of an old-established Catholic and royalist family. Originally drapers, they had early in the sixteenth century abandoned trade for a liberal profession, and Bossuet's grandfather, uncle, and two cousins were all counsellors of the *parlement* of Dijon. From his birth he was, like Samuel, dedicated to God, and at the age of eight he received the tonsure at Metz, where his father, having been appointed a counsellor of the *parlement*, had gone to live two years previously. At thirteen he was made a Canon of the Cathedral, and at fifteen he entered the college of Navarre, still the most prominent college of the University of Paris, where as a highly promising pupil he was specially befriended by the grandmaster, Nicolas Cornet, the well-known opponent of the Jansenists. During his ten years' residence he studied philosophy and theology and became a competent scholar both in Greek and Latin. With a view to his future career he gave particular attention to Demosthenes, Isocrates, and Cicero, but he also read with care and appreciation the poets, historians and philosophers. Among his favourites were Homer, Virgil, Horace, Terence, Livy, and Sallust. His extracts from Aristotle have been preserved. Having attained his degree of licentiate, he was ordained priest in 1652 and returned to Metz, where he was appointed to an archdeaconry. Here he remained for seven years, performing his work as a priest with whole-hearted devotion and carrying on with unremitting diligence his study of the Bible and the Fathers.

"One has only to see his New Testament and his Bible," says the Abbé Le Dieu, who was his secretary for the last twenty-four years of his life, "to be convinced of the continual use that he made of it. Though he knew the text almost by heart, he never ceased to read it and re-read it every day of his life and to make fresh comments on it."

Of the Fathers St. Augustine was by a long way his chief source of wisdom. He wrote almost nothing without consulting him, and it is rare to find a sermon in which his name does not occur. The works that he had most read, says Le Dieu, were the *De Civitate Dei*, the *Commentaries on the Psalms*, and

the treatises against the Pelagians. Copies of these accompanied him everywhere, and as the volumes of the great Benedictine edition of the whole works appeared (1679-1700), these too formed part of his travelling library. In his younger days he was greatly attracted by the forceful and brilliant rhetoric of Tertullian, but his faults of taste and his heretical opinions gradually repelled him. In St. Cyprian, Tertullian's pupil and convert, who had been a professor of rhetoric, he found a more chastened example of African eloquence. To St. Ambrose he was naturally attracted, both as the teacher of St. Augustine and as an eminent orator. Another of his favourites was St. Gregory the Great, whose *Pastoral*, or advice to Bishops, naturally appealed to him. To St. Bernard, often called the last of the Fathers, whom he regarded as one of the greatest after St. Augustine, he paid honour in a remarkable Panegyric, preached at Metz in 1653.

Of the Greek Fathers his favourite was St. Chrysostom, whom he regarded as a model of oratory and as the greatest preacher of the Church. He praised Origen for his "happy reflections and his tenderness of expression," and he often quoted passages from him. In his sermons, however, he is not as often on his lips as St. Gregory Nazianzen, who with his friend St. Basil and St. Basil's brother, St. Gregory of Nyssa, was after St. Chrysostom the chief representative of Greek Christian eloquence in the fourth century. Coming to the schoolmen, he was hardly less familiar with St. Thomas Aquinas than with the Fathers, but when he said that "all learned men are agreed that St. Thomas was only St. Augustine reduced to the scholastic method" he forgot his debt to Greek philosophy and Aristotle.

On All Saints' Day, 1649, Bossuet, aged twenty-two, and in sub-deacon's orders, preached his first sermon in his college chapel, and two and a half years later, on Easter Eve, 1652, he preached in the same chapel his first sermon as a priest. This latter sermon follows in structure the usual practice of the day.

It opens with two exordiums, or to use Bossuet's own terms, with an *avant propos* or *Ave Maria* and an exordium proper. It was his habit to write the first exordium after the rest of the sermon and to give particular attention to it. It generally ends with a prayer to the Holy Spirit, either by the intercession of the Virgin Mary, or directly to the Virgin. In the sermon that we are now considering it begins with an arresting passage:

> When I see those rich tombs under which the great ones of the earth seem desirous of hiding the shame of their corruption, I cannot wonder enough at the utter folly of men who erect such magnificent trophies to a handful of ashes and a few old bones.

This may not be in perfect taste, but it must certainly have aroused the attention of Bossuet's hearers. At the end of the second exordium he proposes to divide his sermon into three points, all taken from his text (Rom. vi. 9 and 10). In the first point—He died unto sin (*mortuus est peccato*)*—he insists with St. Augustine, as against the Pelagians, on the doctrine of original sin—" ce pêché d'origine avec lequel nous raissons." And the only way to conquer sin is by penitence—not a mere superficial reformation, but a real rooting up of evil desires. His hearers will murmur, he says, that Lent is over and that they have had enough of penitence; Easter is the season of joy. Yes, but not of profane pleasures and amusements. And this brings him to his second and third points which he takes together. If sin brings death, the resurrection brings life—eternal life.

I have especially noticed the first point of this sermon because Bossuet's belief in the doctrine of original sin, which, following St. Augustine, he regards as the perversion of free-will, is one of the foundations upon which his whole religious philosophy rests. Another feature of the sermon is that the references in it to the Fathers are fairly numerous—six times to St. Augustine, three times to Tertullian, " that admirable doctor," and once each to Origen, to St. Chrysostom, " that marvellous interpreter," to " the great saint," St. Cyril, to Pope Innocent I., and to the Hymn to Christ by St. Clement of Alexandria. The references would have been appreciated by Bossuet's audience, which consisted of his teachers and fellow-students, for the most part theologians.

The next sermon of Bossuet's that has come down to us was preached four months later in the Cathedral of Metz, and it was natural that the young canon should wish to give his new congregation of his very best. He begins with a striking and impressive account of our Lord's approach to Jerusalem a few days before His Passion, and of how, as recorded by St. Luke, He wept over the beautiful city and foretold its destruction. The sermon has two points, the Saviour full of compassion, and the Saviour inexorable. Hence the title by which it is known, *La bonté et la rigueur de Dieu.* In the first point Bossuet dwells with great tenderness on the many manifestations of our Lord's compassion during His ministry and of His sympathy for every form of suffering. In the second point he warns those who harden their hearts against repentance that in the end we may make even the heart of Jesus hardened and inexorable. " That was the fate of Jerusalem." Then he proceeds to describe at length, in the words of Josephus, the siege and capture

* It will be noticed that the Vulgate is differently stopped to our version, which correctly follows the Greek.

of the city by the Romans under Titus, dwelling on the horrid details with perhaps too great insistence. In conclusion, he turns on the hardened sinners—"Tremblez donc, pécheurs endurcis"—and warns them that, though God in His infinite mercy may hold His hand for a time, yet, unless they repent, they cannot escape His just vengeance. It is, as Sainte-Beuve says, a youthful sermon, bold and exuberant, and with defects of exaggeration and doubtful taste. He notes too the air of affectionate proprietorship with which Bossuet speaks of *my* text, *my* 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, *my* Gospel, and also the naive simplicity with which he says at the close, "I have tried to make you see, *selon que Dieu m'a inspiré*, on the one hand, the pity which invites us, on the other, the justice which terrifies us." Both are little touches which help us to understand Bossuet's influence as a preacher. It was in no merely formal fashion that he prayed to the Holy Spirit. Just as Peter, "filled with the Holy Ghost," after the miracle worked on the impotent men impressed the rulers of the people and the elders with his boldness, so Bossuet, believing himself to be inspired by the Holy Spirit, preached as an apostle of God, on whom "a cloven tongue as of fire" had descended.

As I have said, he remained at Metz for seven years, studying and preaching continually. The faults of those early sermons are obvious. They arise partly from an excessive admiration for Tertullian, partly from a too great effort at eloquence, partly from the wave of bad taste which passed over French literature after the death of Richelieu (1642). The chief faults are an unwieldy accumulation of material, an excessive use of dialectic, a love of unusual metaphors, and a certain violence and exaggeration of statement, due, as M. Rébelliau points out, to the militant zeal of the young orator.

His conversion to a purer and more chastened style of oratory may be ascribed in some measure to the influence of that great figure in French religious history, St. Vincent de Paul, who was an advocate of a simple form of eloquence. In Lent of 1658 he was charged by the Queen-Mother to send a mission of Lazarists, as the priests of his great institution, the Congregation of the Mission of St. Lazare, were called, to Metz and he invited Bossuet, who on his visit to Paris was in the habit of attending the Tuesday conferences at St. Lazare, to be one of the missionaries. Four of the sermons that Bossuet preached on this occasion have been preserved. The most striking is *On Satisfaction*, that is to say, Repentance, the only one preached in the Cathedral. At the close of it, after referring to the repentance of Nineveh as related by Jonah, he exhorts the city of Metz to follow its example:

Plût à Dieu que je visse à bas la table de tes débauches, et les banques de tes usuriers, et les retraites honteuses de tes impudiques. . . . Qua tardes-tu, ô ville ? Renverse-toi par la pénitence; cette chute te relèvera jusqu'à la gloire éternelle.

Decidedly Bossuet was not one who, as he said of another preacher, "put cushions under the elbows of sinners."

In the following year (1659) he left Metz for Paris where he lodged with other learned priests at the deanery of Saint-Thomas-du-Louvre. In 1660 he preached a Lent course at the Minimes of the Place-Royale, and in 1661 a similar one at the Carmelites of the faubourg Saint-Jacques. The latter was before a select audience, composed largely of great ladies, either relatives of the high-born nuns or attendants on the Queen and the Queen-Mother. It was a good preparation for the Carême du Louvre, which Bossuet was commanded to preach in 1662 and which marks the attainment of his eloquence to its brilliant maturity.

This was the first of four "stations," as they were called, that he preached before the Court, the other three being the Advent course at the Louvre in 1665, the Lent course at St. Germain in 1666, and the Advent course at St. Germain in 1669. Advent courses included a sermon on All Saints' Day as well as sermons on each Sunday in Advent. Lent courses began with a sermon on The Purification of the Virgin Mary, and there were sermons on Wednesdays and Fridays as well as on Sundays throughout Lent. Le Dieu tells us that Bossuet's preparation for his sermons consisted of a few notes and profound meditation on the morning of the day on which he was going to preach. This is true of the latter part of his life, when Le Dieu was his secretary and he was preaching simple sermons to his own flock at Meaux. But for the period of the great stations before the Court it is far from true. Bossuet's first step at this time was carefully to prepare the whole plan of his course. Then he wrote out his sermon in full and carefully revised it. But he did not learn it by heart like Bourdaloue, or read it like Liddon, or even take it into the pulpit. He was always ready to give a different turn to his thought, or, as all real orators do when moved by contact with their hearers, to improvise. Thus the printed text of Bossuet's sermons, which in M. Lebarq's admirable edition correctly reproduces his manuscripts, does not absolutely represent what he actually said. According to Lord Acton Liddon was "the greatest power in the conflict with sin that the nation now possesses." I should have thought that it was rather with unbelief that Liddon waged such powerful warfare, but the remark would certainly have been true of Bossuet in his day. He concerns himself little with dogma or

doctrine, for he regarded the teaching of the Church as established beyond question, and when he refers to atheists and free-thinkers it is generally with contempt. But on sin he makes unceasing warfare. As M. Rébelliau, who of the many distinguished writers on Bossuet seems to me to understand him best, points out, he says little about secondary sins. He concentrates his efforts on the main sources of sin, on the love of pleasure, on ambition, on pride—in other words, on the flesh, the world and the devil, the three things that we promise to renounce in the Catechism, the three temptations of our Lord.

On the Love of Pleasures is the title often given to a sermon preached by Bossuet during the Lent course at St. Germain in 1666, though the title which he himself gave to it is *The Prodigal Son.* A characteristic of the love of pleasure, he points out, is inconstancy, a wandering from object to object, a revulsion from appetite to disgust and from disgust to appetite. Another sermon on this vice, and, to my mind, a finer one, is that which he preached on the Second Sunday in Lent in 1662, entitled *Le Mauvais riche*, the text both for this and for the Wednesday and Friday sermons of the same week being taken from the Gospel of the preceding Thursday. Dives, says Bossuet, "was a man of pleasure and good cheer." We are not told that he was guilty of any crime or special sin, of adulteries or robberies or acts of violence. But he was so wholly grown up to the things of this world that he forgot God. In the second point he draws a striking picture of such a man, who, plunged in a continual round of visits and intrigues, knows no liberty and no peace:

> What are you doing, great man of affairs, you who are in every secret, and without whom this great comedy of the world would lack an indispensable personage? What are you doing for the great affair, the affair of eternity?

In the third point, he remarks on the hardness and cruelty which are the natural results of a voluptuary's life. "He delights in oppressing the just who oppose him, the poor that are doomed to be his prey." Then having pictured the man of pleasure in his life, he shews us him on his death-bed:

> Surrounded by an infinite number of friends, physicians, and servants, you will remain without help, more desolate, more abandoned than the beggar who dies on straw without a covering for his burial.

The harvest had failed in the previous year and in this spring of 1662 there was still great distress. So Bossuet in his peroration calls upon his hearers, if they do not wish to die in abandonment, to listen to the cry of the poor. "In the distant provinces," he says, "and even in this town of Paris, in the

midst of so many pleasures and such great luxury, an infinite number of families are dying of hunger and despair." Finally, addressing himself to the young king, who by the dismissal of Foucquet six months earlier had become, in fact as well as in theory, an absolute monarch, he reminds him of the sublime pleasure that comes from helping the miserable. "We must humbly pray God to point out to so great a king the means of satisfying his duty to his conscience, and of putting a crown on his glory."

Bossuet wrote three Lent sermons on Ambition, and of one of these, the third, we have a complete manuscript, which is composed almost entirely of reminiscences of the two earlier ones. In the *Ave Maria* he refers to St. Augustine as saying that "the essential duty of a Christian is to repress ambition," and he adds, "It is not a light undertaking to preach this truth to the Court." It certainly was not, but he faced his audience of ambitious men and women with confident boldness. Power, he said, does not always bring independence; tyrants are often the slaves of their passions.

Éveille-toi, pauvre esclave, et reconnais que, si c'est une grande puissance de pouvoir s'exécuter ses desseins, la grande et la véritable, c'est de régner sur ses volontés.

Therefore, Christians, he says, instead of longing ardently for a great sphere of power, let us be content to give a good account of the power which God entrusts to us. A river, in order to do good, has no need to overflow its banks; flowing peacefully in its bed, it waters the land for the public good. In the second point he warns his hearers how often vast ambitious projects end in ruin. Paraphrasing the magnificent chapter of Ezekiel in which, after comparing Assyria to a great cedar of Lebanon, he prophesies its downfall, he dwells in forcible language on the insecurity of great fortunes.

Et tant de sueurs, et tant de travaux, et tant de crimes, et tant d'injustices, sans pouvoir jamais arracher de la fortune, à laquelle tu te dévoues, qu'un misérable peut-être! Regarde qu'il n'y a rien d'assuré pour toi, non pas méme un tombeau pour graver dessus tes titres superbes, seuls restes de ta grandeur abattue: l'avarice ou la négligence de tes héritiers le refuseront peut-être à ta mémoire: tant on pensera peu à toi quelques années apres ta mort.

Bossuet, as he often did, prepared two perorations for this sermon, one of which was addressed to the King, in case he should be present. As it was not wanted, he used it on Palm Sunday, a fortnight later, for a sermon entitled *On the Duties of Kings*, in which he expounds his theory of absolute monarchy. In the words of St. Paul, "there is no power but of God."

The King is God's representative; hence the fear, the respect, the reverence that he inspires. Man dies, but the King, as we say, never dies; for he is the image of the immortal God. In his second point he specially calls the attention of Louis XIV. to his duty to the Church. Let him stifle new doctrines (*i.e.*, Jansenism) and heresy (*i.e.*, Protestantism); let him exterminate blasphemies and scandalous crimes; let him encourage virtue, let him love justice, which is the veritable virtue of monarchs. Finally, after a beautiful prayer to God to grant him that wisdom which Solomon desired, Bossuet charges him to be faithful to God, and not to hinder by his sins the high destiny that awaits his reign.

There is, I believe, no sermon of Bossuet's that has pride for its main subject, but in one of great interest that he preached on Demons at Metz in 1653, which is chiefly about Satan, he begins his second point with, "The sin of Satan was an insupportable arrogance," and he adds that "the mark of pride is to attribute everything to oneself." So in his *Pensées chrétiennes et morales* he declares that "Pride is the great evil of the human race." And in his *Traité de la Concupiscence* he devotes two-fifths of the whole treatise to what St. John in his second Epistle (ii. 16) calls "the pride of life."

But though Bossuet's attack on sin is chiefly directed against the three great sources of sin, he does not altogether forget the lesser forms of sin. Preaching to the Court, he is more especially concerned with those that were rife in his day among the aristocratic classes, such as gambling (in which he includes cheating at cards) and duelling. This latter vice, against which Louis XIV. had set his face, he appropriately deals with in a sermon *On Honour*, preached in Lent, 1666. In the same sermon he also attacks unchastity, "which takes the name of gallantry."

In an earlier sermon, one of those preached for the mission at Metz, he took for his subject *La Médisance* or evil-speaking, a vice which he describes as universal, which he attacked again in a sermon of 1681, against which Bourdaloue hammered with great insistence ten years later, but which nevertheless remained the prevailing vice of the eighteenth century. It was, in fact, an almost indispensable feature of the salon with its encouragement of the desire to shine in conversation. Bossuet defines it as "a certain pleasure that one has in speaking evil of others without any particular reason," and he says that it comes from three causes, envy, vanity, and censoriousness, all of which have their roots in pride. Finally, he compares the growth of scandal, as it passes from lip to lip, to the effect of a stone thrown into a pond:

Vous voyez se former sur la surface de l'eau des ronds, petits, plus grands, et enfin tout l'étang en est agité; qui en est ta cause ? celui qui a jeté la pierre.

The sermon *On Ambition*, which was preached on the Fourth Sunday in Lent, was followed on the succeeding Wednesday by an equally fine one—*On Death*. It is especially remarkable because in its thought it recalls throughout the *Pensées* of Pascal, though neither man can have influenced the other. It will be recollected that Pascal's contemplated Apology, of which the *Pensées* are the fragments, starts from his conception of the dual nature of man—of man in his misery and man in his greatness. With striking similarity Bossuet divides his sermon into two parts, the first that man is infinitely miserable, because he passes like a shadow, the second that man is infinitely estimable, because death is the gate to eternity. The first point, says Faguet, "contains the most burning words that fell from Bossuet's lips." Here is an example:

Durez autant que ces grands chênes sous lesquels nos ancêtres se sont reposés, et qui donneront encore de l'ombre à notre prospérité; entassez dans cet espace, qui paraît immense, honneurs, richesses, plaisirs: que vous profitera cet amas, puisque le dernier souffle de la mort, tout faible, tout languissant, abattra tout à coup cette vaine pompe avec la même facilité qu'un château de cartes, vain amusement des enfants ?

In the second point, which deals with man's greatness, Bossuet declares his admiration for the "marvellous discoveries" of science. "Man," he says, "has almost changed the face of the world." He has harnessed fire and water, "those two great enemies," for our service. More, "he has mounted to the heavens,"—a strangely prophetic remark, though, of course, he is only referring to the progress of astronomy.

In the fifth week in Advent Bossuet devoted all his three sermons to the subject of Penitence, taking his texts from the story of Mary Magdalene, "that perfect model of penitence", as told by St. Luke. All three sermons, *The Efficiency of Penitence*, *The Ardour of Penitence*, and *The Integrity of Penitence* testify to the preacher's sure insight into human nature, as with a firm hand he probes the heart of sinners and lays bare their reasons for avoiding repentance. Finest of all is the second sermon, in which, as Gandar says, breathes all the tenderness of Christian charity. The exordium opens with a beautiful picture of the Magdalene, just as she feels the call to repentance and lingers for a moment before taking her great resolution. The first point contains the famous passage beginning, "Oh man made in the image of God, you run after mortal pleasure, you sigh after mortal beauties," followed by a dramatic dialogue

with a sinner who puts off repentance and whom Bossuet compares (after Horace) to a wayfarer waiting to cross a river till it has run down.

> But perhaps I am mistaken and passions do run down. True, a passion does run down; but another passion takes its place. Each age has its dominant passion; pleasure makes way for ambition, and ambition for avarice. . . . It is the history of the human race; the love of the world only changes its name; one vice makes room for another.

Then he warns his hearers that, though God's love and mercy are infinite, He will be forced at last to punish the sinner who rejects His grace. In the words of St. John the Baptist, "The axe is laid to the root of the trees." This is the text of the last sermon of the Advent course of 1665, a sermon entitled *The Necessity of Penitence*, and it is repeated like a refrain. Bossuet begins his exordium with "Let us bring to the Court the preacher of the desert; let us introduce a St. John the Baptist with all his austerity." Accordingly, like the Baptist, he calls his hearers to repentance. In the first point he insists that each vice—injustice, evil-speaking, impure love, ambition, avarice—carries with it an earthly punishment; in the second he warns those who harden their hearts against repentance that eternal punishment awaits them. In a later sermon, preached in Advent, 1668, not before the Court but at Saint-Thomas du Louvre, he took for his text the words "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness," and he drew a striking picture of the Baptist "clothed in camel's hair." Then, following his example, he bade his hearers withdraw from the world, not altogether, but at intervals, for meditation and repentance.

In the sermon for the First Sunday in Advent, 1669, he once more urged them to repent before it was too late. Passions, he said, may become less ardent in old age, but they become more of a habit and more difficult to shake off. Addressing the King, who was now the declared lover of Mme. de Montespan and who was preparing for the iniquitous war against Holland, he calls his attention to the passage from St. Luke, in which our Lord foretells the day of His coming with majesty and power. "What will it serve you, Sire, if having filled the whole world with your name and all history with your deeds, you do not apply yourself to the works which are counted before God and which deserve to be recorded in the book of life?" Then he draws an awe-inspiring picture of the day when

> the consuming fire which goes before the face of the terrible judge will sweep away in a single day, towns, fortresses and palaces . . . and will reduce to a heap of cinders all the monuments of kings.

What did Louis think of this picture? At any rate, he was present on the next Sunday, when Bossuet preached *On the Divinity of Jesus Christ*, and he must have heard with pleasure, for he was rigidly orthodox, the attack on "those pronounced atheists (*libertins*), those slaves of their passions, who, plunged as they are in low pursuits, boldly pronounce judgment on the highest questions. . . . Behold the profound night, the thick darkness which surrounds you—you, and the feebleness, the imbecility, and the ignorance of your reason."

Bossuet does not appear to have distinguished free-thinkers from atheists and he apparently uses the word *libertin* indifferently for both. In the sermon for All Saints' Day with which he inaugurated the Advent station of 1669 he denounces by name the man whose *Essays*, till recently, had been the Bible of the free-thinkers. His special objection to Montaigne was that "he preferred animals to man, their instincts to our reason, their simple and innocent nature to our sophistications and malice." He is thinking, of course, of the *Apology for Raimond Sebond*, and it has always seemed to me that both he and Pascal, whose *Pensées* were published in the following year, had confined their reading of Montaigne to this exceptionally long essay and a few others of a pronounced sceptical tendency. However this may be, it is worth noting that in this year 1669 was published the last edition of the *Essays* that appeared for more than fifty years.

This sermon, which according to M. Lebarq is one of the most important of all, and which Sainte-Beuve greatly admired, is a commentary on its text, "That God may be all in all" (1 Cor. xv. 48), and Bossuet begins by giving St. Augustine's explanation, which is, that the spirits of the blessed will have in God their common vision, their common joy, and their common peace. There will be no more error, for they will see God; there will be no more sorrow, for they will rejoice in God; there will be no more fear, for they will rest in God. These "sublime truths" provide the preacher with his three points. He ends his first with an eloquent apostrophe to truth, "Nothing is more harmonious than truth; no melody sweeter, no concord better understood: no beauty more perfect or more ravishing." In the second point he expatiates on the nature of Christian joy and how it differs from worldly pleasures—"pernicious flatterers, untrustworthy counsellors, which ruin the soul, the body, glory, fortune, religion, and conscience." In the third point he introduces a beautiful simile from a ship tossed by the winds and waves in an unknown sea, till its pilot orders an anchor to be dropped and it finds a port in the immensity and tumult

of the ocean. Finally, as in the previous sermon, he addresses the King:

> Live, ever happy, ever fortunate, victorious over your enemies, the father of your people: but live ever good, ever pious, ever attached to religion, ever a protector of the Church.

It is evident that Louis XIV. approved of Bossuet as a preacher, for in September, 1669, he made him Bishop of Condom, and in the following September he gave a more signal mark of his approval by appointing him tutor to the Dauphin. This was the end of his great period as a preacher, for during the tutorship he naturally preached very little, and after the Dauphin's education was completed (1679) and he became Bishop of Meaux (1681) his sermons were addressed chiefly to his flock. There were, it is true, some great exceptions—five funeral orations, the great sermon *On the Unity of the Church* in November, 1681, and a remarkable one preached on Easter Day of that year, in which he faced the Court with his usual outspokenness, and addressing the King, now at the height of his power, as "Arbitre de l'Univers," said to him, "You have only one enemy to fear—yourself."

Like every orthodox Christian of his day, Bossuet regarded original sin as the result of a single lapse from primitive innocence. And he held the doctrine in the acute form given to it by his master St. Augustine, a form which Baron von Hügel reminds us has never been finally accepted by the Roman Catholic Church. In his later years, indeed, he became even more austere, and in the two treatises which he wrote in 1694, the *Maximes sur la Comêdie* and the *Traité de la Concupiscence*,* he bans every form of amusement as a temptation of the Devil, or, as he calls him, *Le Malin*.

To his relentless warfare on sin Bossuet brought a deep knowledge of the human heart, a knowledge, however, that was in the large rather than in the particular, and that was sure rather than subtle. With an eye as unerring as that of his friends, Condé and Turenne, for the key-positions of the enemy, he attacked them with all the forces at his disposal, the forces of an unrivalled oratory. Both Fénelon and La Bruyère objected to the abuse of divisions by the preachers of their day, but Bossuet confined himself to two or three divisions, preceded by a couple of exordiums. These helped to give order to his argument. "Disons les choses par l'ordre," he says in one of his sermons, and it is an admirable maxim.† Moreover, the divisions not only give a useful indication of

* See Chap. XXV. for Bossuet's account of the Fall.

† Liddon, who studied Bossuet closely, from his sermon on Whitsunday, 1868, onwards adopted the plan of an exordium and three or four divisions.

his plan, but they provide resting-places for the listener. For within his points Bossuet carries him forward from argument to argument with an impetuous rapidity which never allows his interest to flag.

Bossuet was a master of the French language and he treats it as a faithful servant, making it fit his thoughts as a glove fits the hand. He frames his sentences with consummate skill; they are never unwieldy, never even too long. He chooses his words for their propriety and their expressiveness, preferring the concrete word to the abstract. For he has an eye for the outward world, which he calls up at will before his inward vision. Hence his power of description, of which we have had striking examples in his pictures of the Baptist and the Magdalene, of the rich man on his death bed, and of our Lord weeping over Jerusalem. Hence his happy use of metaphors and similes, of which the latter, at least in his mature period, are never elaborate or far-fetched, but are taken from familiar objects, especially from the sights of nature. I have referred to the comparison of true Christian ambition to a river which flows peacefully between its banks in the sermon *On Ambition* and of the growth of scandal to a stone flung into a pond in the sermon *On Evil-speaking*. The sermon *On Death* is rich with imagery. Often, too, the poet that is in Bossuet wells up in lyrical outbursts, generally in the form of what is known as prosopopeia—that is to say, impassioned addresses to imaginary persons or personified abstractions.

We have, so far as I know, no such testimony to Bossuet's delivery of his sermons as we have to Bourdaloue's. But we may feel sure that speech and gesture nobly enforced his argument. Yet more than by oratorical flights or by charm of speech and gesture must his hearers have been impressed by his absolute sincerity and by his tone of intense conviction that he was delivering an inspired message. Add to this an imposing figure and an expression at once commanding and benign, and we may be sure that they listened to him not only as a great preacher, but as a great man. ARTHUR TILLEY.

"MANUDUCTIO AD CŒLUM"—A FORGOTTEN CLASSIC

I.

EACH October is the double anniversary connected with a great devotional classic which through the passage of time has grown old and, like most old things and people, has become neglected

and almost forgotten. The writer of *Manuductio ad Cœlum* was born on October 10, 1609, at Mons Regalis in North Italy, and he died at Rome in 1674 on October 28.

John (Giovanni) Bona was the son of aristocratic parents, and soon he gave evidence of exceptional brilliance. As a mere boy he gained quite a reputation for eloquence, and first at the Cistercian Monastery at Pignerol and then at Rome he clearly showed his wisdom in having declined a military career in order to devote himself to scholarship. After completing his course of study in the Imperial City, he returned to his monastery at Pignerol. There he passed quickly and successfully through the various offices until, at the age of forty-two, he was made Abbot-General. In this new capacity much work was allotted to him, and naturally he made Rome his residence and centre of activity. It was here that he was brought into contact with Cardinal Chigi, who in 1655 was elected Pope as Alexander VII., and it was mainly due to him that Bona continued to remain in the city instead of fulfilling his personal wish of retiring to a monastery for a life of prayer and study. Through the instrumentality of Chigi many high honours were conferred on Bona, and in 1669 Clement IX. made him a Cardinal. On the Pope's death there were many who considered Cardinal Bona worthy of being the next successor of St. Peter. Very familiar are the lines written at this time in favour of Bona's election as Pope:

Grammaticæ leges plerumque Ecclesia spernit:
Forte erit ut liceat dicere Papa bona.
Vana solœcismi ne te conturbet imago:
Esset Papa bonus si Bona Papa foret.

However, this single honour was not given to him, but to Altieri who became pope as Clement X (1670-1676), and one can well believe that none was so elated as the Cardinal himself. Though circumstances compelled him to be active and practical in the interests of the Church and the Community he loved and served, he was by nature a masculine Mary rather than a Martha, though this is not to suggest that his administrative and organizing work was in any way a failure. In Rome he held a place of great importance and his opinion on policy and propaganda carried much weight, and the Pope was not above taking his advice. "Serving tables" was to Bona more a duty necessitated by his office than a desire of his own. Once he wrote: "The Life we lead is like that of the Pismire (*i.e.*, ant), a perpetual and fruitless Ramble and Agitation; one while up, and another while down, and still empty. The great Creator of all things made Man out of Nothing, and He that gave us all, expects all, and to be beloved and serv'd without a Rival,

as the Author of our Being: And it is all but time lost, that we employ any other ways."

His spiritual writings vividly reveal his deep other-worldliness, and when they are compared with the performances of his own life, then it can be realized that he was an excellent example of one who was active and contemplative, practical and mystical, Martha and Mary. His works are veritable reservoirs of devotion and learning, and if *Manuductio ad cœlum* is easily the best known, it is a compliment to that work and no insult to the other works. *Principia et documenta viæ christianæ* shows a happy combination of the learned and spiritual author, and there are many gems to be found in the brief sentences which are a characteristic of the writer's style. *De sacrificio missæ* is a helpful study of the Holy Eucharist and was translated into English by Cummins (Herder, 1903). *De rebus liturgicis* (1671) has been most valuable to students dealing with that subject. Two other important works are *De discretione spirituum* and *Horologium asceticum*. Many editions have been published of these various works, and especially in Venice 1752-1764.*

II

The *Manuductio ad Cœlum* was popularized in this country through the faithful translation made by Sir Roger L'Estrange (1616-1704). He was the son of an old family of Hunstanton, and his whole life was an amazing succession of unusual experiences. Early in his manhood he was betrayed in a plot for the recapture of Lynn, seized, condemned, reprieved, left for a few years in Newgate, and then allowed to escape. After 1659 he became famous as a pamphleteer and his efforts were directed towards the restoration of Charles II.; some of these writings can be read in *L'Estrange his Apology*. He wrote a violent and well-known attack on Milton entitled *No Blinde Guides*. He was always the most bitter opponent of Presbyterianism. In 1663 he published his *Considerations and Proposals in order to the Regulation of the Press*, and as a result became a licenser and surveyor of printing presses. He was for a short time the copyright holder of all news and edited two weekly news-books called the *Intelligencer* and the *News*, but later his *Gazette* brought him into such ill-favour that he lost his position as the only press agency. He censored many seditious publications, and soon was a famous character in the world of letters. In 1667 he began his work of translations with an English edition of Quevodo's *Visions*. In 1680 he was mixed up in the "Popish Plot"; and through his endeavours to cool

* *Cf.* extracts in *Opuscula ascetica selecta*. Freiburg: Herder, 1911.

the hatred against Rome, his attacks on Titus Oates and confreres, the accusation was brought against him of being a "papist in disguise." Though acquitted of the charge, he had to flee to Holland. On his return in 1681 he started his political newspaper *The Observator: In Question and Answer*, which ran for nearly six years before its suppression. In April, 1685, he was knighted by James II., but after that his fortunes failed. He was frequently arrested for his political associations; his wife died a gambler's tragic death, his children were separated from him, his health became bad, his influence waned, and he became a bookseller's hack. During this period he wrote the incomparable *Fables of Æsop and other Eminent Mythologists: with Moral Reflections* (1692) and *Fables and Stories Moralized* (1699). In the sphere of translation his main works were *Josephus*, for which he was paid by the page, *Select Colloquies out of Erasmus Roterodamus*, Seneca's *Morals*, Tully's *Offices*, *The Spanish Decameron* as well as selected parts of Terence and Tacitus.

The exact date of L'Estrange's translation of Bona's *Manuductio ad Cœlum* is somewhat difficult to trace, but the fact that there was a second edition in 1680 and frequent re-editions would suggest that the original anglicized copy appeared in about 1675 to 1678. It was given the title of "*A Guide to Eternity*," though such was a rather free translation of the Latin name. The Book seems to have had a most welcome reception, because by 1722 it had passed through seven English editions,* which was no mean accomplishment for a devotional book which has quotations from the ancient philosophers and which in many parts cannot be regarded as too easy reading. Compared with the popular book *The Pilgrim's Progress*—the complete story of which appeared in the third edition of 1679, which may very probably be about the time of L'Estrange's translation—the *Guide to Eternity* is as different as St. John's Gospel from St. Mark's, and so its success as a selling proposition is all the more remarkable, though it must be recognized that the very fact that so eminent and notorious a person as L'Estrange had translated it, would have enhanced its value to the reading public.

III

In the preface the General of the Feuillants states that he has "drawn up a Compendium of moral Institutions and Counsels (the best I could) out of the writings of the Fathers, Seneca, Epictetus, Antoninus, and others of the Ancients, both

* So far as the present writer is aware the last English edition appeared in 1900, when J. W. Stanbridge edited it for Methuen's Library of Devotion.

Christian and Pagan," and these quotations, not always easily traced to their sources by the reader, are of inestimable value and interest. He claims not to be a "teaching Master, but a teaching scholar," and he boldly admits that "there is very little of this Discourse that I can honestly call my own." He writes primarily for himself with "my Reader my Confident" and he pictures himself as a patient, not a doctor, in the great hospital, which is the world, and needing cure for the manifold maladies to which his immortal soul is subject.

The aim of the book is to aid man the better to achieve his end, which is nothing less than the Beatific Vision. "The thing I have propounded in this Discourse is to bring the Reader to Heaven, that is to say, unto that perfect State of Bliss to which we are all directed by a Natural Impulse, as the principal End of our Being."* The tragedy of life is that so many mistake what is really the *summum bonum*, and in acquiring what they erroneously imagine to be happiness, are miserable. Because the way to God is straight and narrow, and because so many side-ways allure the traveller from the true way, there is an imperative need for man to "apply himself to the Counsel and government of a Prudent Master."† One may note here how this passage compares with one from Father Baker's *Sancta Sophia*, which was published in 1657, by Father Serenus Cressy. "A soul that comes out of the world to a religious contemplative life, or that living yet in the world is abstracted from the world and aspires to a state of perfection, at the first ordinarily will stand in need of an external director and guide for most matters that concern her in that way."‡ Cardinal Bona is well aware of the damage which an incompetent master or director can do to the soul; St. Teresa or St. John of the Cross were not the only ones who knew the havoc that poor confessors could work. The true master must be "like an experienced Physician, presently (*i.e.*, immediately) make a Judgment of the Disease, and prescribe you the Remedy. Such a one he must be, as is able to dive into the Secrets and Recesses of the Inward Man, and to suit himself to the Humours and Dispositions of those he has to do withal, in order to their Spiritual Advantage. . . . One to whom a man may securely commit the most recondite Privacies of his Soul, and confess himself without a Blush. One, in fine, that can distinguish betwixt good and evil." And then the Cardinal adds "and *happy is he that finds such a Treasure.*"§

Next the subject of sin is dealt with, and the remedy for

* Ch. I., i. (the edition used here throughout in quotation is the seventh).
† Ch. II., i. ‡ *Sancta Sophia*, Ch. II., i.
§ *Guide to Eternity*, Ch. II., ii. (italics in original).

sin and the inclination towards sin is said to be a perpetual remembrance of Death and Eternity. "The thing we are principally to intend, (whether busie or idle, in labour or at rest) is this: to deliver our selves out of the power of Time and Casualties, by the anticipation of Eternity, which places us in a state of Tranquillity, that is steady and invariable."*

An examination follows of certain vices to which all are prone. Firstly, Gluttony is mentioned, and what may seem a rather humorous remark is made in relation to the story of the Fall, namely, that Gluttony is "the Sin that brought Death into the World." Some sound advice is given when those who over-feed and over-care for their bodies are reminded that they are "only preparing a Treat for the Worms." Luxury, Avarice, Anger, Envy, Sloth, Pride, Ambition and Vain-glory are dealt with, their horribleness being forcibly explained and the cures for them put forward. In Chapter X. the control of the body comes under survey, and it is said that the body must be "kept in obedience to the Mind, on the one hand; and want nothing that is necessary to Health, on the other." The mention of Health is important, because it is the teaching of all first-class ascetic writers that exterior mortification must never be allowed to impair physical vitality. A guard is to be kept over the senses, particularly that of sight. "There is not anything that more powerfully moves the Imagination, stirs the Appetite, or works upon the Mind, than a wandering Glance; and the Mischief is done in a Moment."† In relation to personal appearance is the sentence: "It is a scandalous Effeminacy for a Man to spend his Time betwixt the Comb and the Glass."

The taming of the tongue has a special chapter devoted to it. A warning is given "to consider before we speak," and the wisest and happiest man is said to be he who "converses much with himself, and little with other people." Gossip is severely condemned, and the goldenness of silence is stressed. Man is bidden patiently to endure slander because when "any Man is ill-spoken of, let him consider; if I have not deserved it, I am none the worse; if I have, I'll mend it."‡ The avoidance of malicious thoughts is simply said to be the employment of our mind with good thoughts.

Love is defined as a "certain Delight or Satisfaction that we take in that which is Good" and "it is the Cement of the World."§ Its power is so great that it can "transform the Lover into the thing belov'd. It is a kind of willing Death, a Separation of the Soul and Body. He that is in love, is out of himself." Only in the loving of God does love express its

* Ch. III., vii. † Ch. X., ii. ‡ Ch. XI., v. § Ch. XIII., i.

purest and highest nature. Carnal Love has parts of bitterness, violence, jealousy and rivalry, but Divine Love is liberated from such traits. Platonic Love is dangerous and deceptive, because "it is very rarely that a man stops at the view of a lovely Woman, without a desire to come nearer; and whether it be a Ray only, or some kind of fascination with it, that passes from the Eye to the Object, somewhat there is that dissolves a Man, and ruins him."*

Following his analysis of Love, Bona proceeds to treat the subject of what ought and ought not to be desired, and this leads to in what man should find Joy and Sorrow, Hope and Despair. In Chapter XVII. the futility of common fears is explained and a method of deliverance from the tyranny of fear suggested. Sickness, poverty, disappointment, exile, loss of sight and even death are worthless things about which to have fears, and being deprived of much that we now hold precious may ultimately result in good to our soul. Reason then comes under the writer's critical examination and it is said that it "was given us by Almighty God to the end that we might know him: But Sin has given it two wounds, Ignorance and Blindness." It is to be used towards knowing Divine Realities and "substantial Wisdom." It is to be husbanded, and not squandered on trifles. "To know that which a Man is never the better for, is next door to downright ignorance."

The conclusion of Chapter XVIII. really represents the end of the Cardinal's treatment of the first of the "Three Ways," the Purgative Way, and the remaining chapters, except the last, are mainly concerned with the outlines of the second Way, the Illuminative. Man after purgation of the grosser elements now turns to the glory of solitude and learns the value of aloneness, in which he arrives at a closer communion with God, because all else has been excluded. A new and overwhelming passion for perfection is born within him, and he desires to be clothed in all the virtues of the Christian life. First, the Theological Virtues are earnestly sought, because they are the hall-marks of virtue. "Charity is the Mistress of all Virtues, and is directed either to God or to our Neighbour"† and its eldest children are Faith and Hope. But even these great and holy possessions need direction, and so Prudence or Wisdom comes as the guide and controller. "Wisdom is the Product of Experience and Memory. The one teaches us what is best to be done; and the other minds us when we are to do it."‡ The resemblance

* Ch. XIII., iv.

† This will recall to modern readers that most interesting thesis of Nygren in his book *Agape and Eros* (trans. A. G. Hebert. S.P.C.K.).

‡ Ch. XXII., ii.

between Vice and Virtue at times may be strong, and only Prudence can give judgment, and immediately the judgment is passed then we are to act, "for good Counsel, without Execution, is of no effect."

Justice is also necessary and it is called "a communicative virtue; ordained for the common Good of Mankind, without any Regard to itself."* It prevents wrong being performed on another. What Justice is in relation to man, Religion is in relation to God. First it teaches knowledge of and faith in God, and then adoration of his Majesty and Greatness. "Barely to know God is not sufficient; for the Devils themselves do as much, that hate him; There must be Love and Adoration, as well as Knowledge." Adoration does not mean merely the worship of praise and thanksgiving, but also "the imitation of him, which does, in a manner, unite us to God, and God to us." But before we can come very close to God we must have known repentance and made reparation for misspent days. Unlike a certain type of modern psychologist who would have people not to dwell upon their past and their sins, Bona expressly says: "Many people are afraid of their own Memories, because if they look back, their sins fly in their Faces. But this should not be. Frequent Reflection is the readiest Way to Reformation."†

Piety towards God and Observance (*i.e.*, respect) towards man must play their parts in the life of him who is growing in grace and seeking the prize of sanctity. These in turn will result in Gratitude and Obedience. The latter is called a "kind of immolation of the Will, which is said to be better than sacrifice" and the former a "sense of a Debt for Benefit received." Obedience must be performed with Alacrity, Readiness and without Expostulation or Murmur. Gratitude must be always expressed by repayment with interest.

Among other themes on which the writer dwells are the Use of Truth, the Qualities of Friendship, the Duties of Fortitude, the Occasions of Patience, the Contribution of Modesty towards Temperance, the Excellency of Meekness and Clemency, and the Character of Humility. In between these sections is a discussion as to the distinction between "liberality" and "magnificence" which clearly is indebted to Aristotle, *Ethics*, Book IV., chapters I. and II., as also is the analysis of the meaning of "magnanimity" indebted to the same work and section (chap. III.) of Aristotle's work.

So at the last the Cardinal comes to define of what true sanctity consists, and briefly he says that "he that wants Nothing, may be properly said to be perfect. And what can

* Ch. XXIII., i. † Ch. XXIII., iv.

that Man want, who is cleans'd and purg'd from his sins, beautiful with all divine Virtues, whose heart is set upon God, and his soul united to him to Eternity ?"* This perfection is not won only by human effort; it is in part the *donum Dei.* Sanctifying Grace enables sins to be overcome and not resorted to again, and the Virtues are the infused gifts of God, and so few attain to heroic sanctity because "there are not many that entertain the Grace when 'tis offer'd them: But however, some there have been in all ages."

The perfect man is fearless of Dangers, unspotted by Lusts, cheerful in Adversity, happy under Reproach, quiet in a Storm and full of God. "He sees the World at his Feet: He studies, contemplates and despises it, with an invincible Tranquillity of Spirit; and yet his Soul keeps her Station, where she had her Original."† Without the Grace of God flesh and blood cannot rise to such heights, and likewise it cannot without the "Necessity of previous Dispositions." Man plans and God acts. God's is the "Helping-hand" which guides man through the wilderness of this world to that blessed Eternity where man kneels forever in adoration before the Vision of the Everlasting and Ever-loving Father.

PATRICK COWLEY.

THE DATA OF THEOLOGY

THEOLOGY may be roughly defined as the intellectual formulation of the contents of religion. But it must be stipulated that the formulation in question takes its subject-matter seriously, that it assumes it to be true (whatever precisely be the proper meaning of "truth" as applied to religion). No inquiry can be entitled "theology" which treats its data in the detached spirit in which the branch of study named "comparative religion" must handle much of its data, and may handle them all. Hence it must at least start with (even if it does not confine itself to), and be primarily interested in, *a* religion—one particular historical stream, that is to say, of religious belief and practice. It is only in this form that religion of any vital character exists in the concrete; apart from particular religions there can be nothing but a vague spirit of religiosity. Hence, if a man is religious enough to be capable of becoming a theologian, he must recognize some one particular religion as being *his* religion—as being, that is (at least substantially, and as a whole), *true*, whether or not he claims that it alone is exclusively true. No doubt an

* Ch. XXXV., i. † Ch. XXXV., ii.

enlightened Christian (for example) at the present day would not stigmatize all other religions as simply false; rather he would insist that all of at least the higher religions of the world contain a large amount of truth. On this ground it is claimed by some thinkers that an adequate theology must take account of all of them, and that, in its ideal perfection, it would formulate the co-ordinated result of the cumulative testimony of the religions generally of the world. To such a suggestion it may indeed be conceded that a competent knowledge of comparative religion is necessary for a fully equipped theologian. It may save him from various errors and crudities of interpretation, and also help him to discern some truths, implicit in his religion, which he might otherwise have overlooked or failed to comprehend adequately. But from its very nature Christianity (whatever may be the case with some other religions) must needs claim to be the final and absolute religion; the reasons for this may perhaps emerge more clearly in the course of our inquiry. Thus the Christian theologian cannot admit independent data, supplied by other religions, side by side with his proper subject-matter; he cannot allow that any truths of religious importance can really be added from outside to the Christian religion. It is that religion which he is concerned to formulate, because for him it must necessarily be *the* religion. The kind of pan-denominational "theology" that has been suggested as a desideratum could not answer the purpose at which theology, as commonly understood, avowedly aims; it could not possibly serve the practical or devotional life of the Church.

Another somewhat kindred, though quite distinct, question may arise as to the proper limits of this science or discipline. It may be suggested that, rightly handled, it becomes identical with philosophy of religion. The business of the latter is to inquire whether, from the standpoint of a sound philosophy, religion has any, and, if so, what justification for existing; to fit it into the whole of our knowledge; and to estimate its significance and value for life. Once more, the more competent the theologian's knowledge of this branch of philosophy, the better; and a complete system of theology can hardly help trenching considerably on its borders. But it is certainly not necessary for theology to incorporate into itself a complete philosophy of religion, any more than any special science need embrace within itself a complete logic or theory of knowledge. Nor can philosophy of religion without trespassing considerably beyond the limits of its outlook and purpose, as commonly recognized, go so deeply into the specific contents of any particular religion as it is the very business of theology to do. Still less ought this to aspire to spread out till it becomes coextensive

with philosophy as such, as has been suggested by the Dean of St. Paul's.* From the side of philosophy, it might be urged that it is no more its business to deal, in detail and in a specialist manner, with the internal concerns of theology than with those of any particular science. Further, religion, like art, involves a highly characteristic mode of apprehension, not purely, or even principally, intellectual. A sound philosophy will indeed appreciate sympathetically the specifically artistic activity, and part of its task will be to formulate the more fundamental principles of æsthetics; but the philosopher (whose work is, after all, primarily intellectual, though it should not be so excessively intellectualist as that of too many philosophers has been) cannot usually be expected to have a sufficient degree, or the particular quality, of æsthetic apprehension to enable him to be an artist or even an art critic. The same considerations must apply still more strongly to religion. To approach the question again from the side of theology—this can have no particular interest in a number of issues that are of the highest importance for philosophy. It cannot possibly be any part of its task to inquire (for instance) how mathematics, or physical science, is possible, and what is the warrant for our relying on the truth of these; nor again to examine the ultimate meaning of "matter," or, in particular, to settle the controversy between realists and idealists. The theologian as such neither need nor should dive further into philosophy than to adumbrate some lines of thought along which a spiritual view of the universe, and further the belief in a personal God, can be intellectually justified. It is no part of his task to develop these into a full-blown system of metaphysics. No doubt it is true, yet once more, that—other things being equal: a most important qualification—the profounder his knowledge of general philosophy, the better he will execute his special work. But Dean Rashdall would seem to have gone altogether too far in saying, "It is my strong conviction that a Theology which is to satisfy thoughtful men in these days must rest upon a basis of thorough-going Metaphysic."†

Theology, then, must confine itself to issues that are of direct concern to religion, and must seek its data only within the sphere of strictly religious phenomena. Thus, if it puts forward a conception of God into which distinctly philosophical ideas enter, it may only do this in order to express vividly and convincingly to a particular age a genuinely religious idea of God, derived from purely religious sources, and to relate this,

* *Cf.* Matthews, *Studies in Christian Philosophy.* Dr. Matthews indeed speaks of "religion" and philosophy; but, if these can be supposed to become, at their *optimum*, identical, *a fortiori* must this be true of theology and philosophy.

† Rashdall, *Doctrine and Development*, p. xii.

for our intellectual assurance, to our general knowledge and our total world-view, lest it should be left hanging insecurely in the air. It is only methodologically that the theologian is, by rights, interested in such philosophical conceptions as he may be forced to use; his science can insist dogmatically only on the properly religious elements in its formulations.

To express this differently—theology has to treat scientifically of all that is concerned distinctively with the saving of the soul, and of such matters only. And to be saved in soul (that is a safer expression than "to save one's soul") means to get, or be brought, into right relations with God, together with whatever is involved in, or follows from, that. For a God of some kind every religion worthy of the name must affirm; and Christianity tells us confidently of a genuinely personal God. Very naturally then every particular religion—it may at least with great probability be affirmed—rests on some special revelation, real or supposed. At any rate Christianity, to which we may from this point on confine our attention, admittedly does so. Its legitimate data therefore have been provided by some kind of activity of God in history, directed to the redemption of mankind and involving the awakening in them, by some methods or other, of a knowledge of Himself.*

Here then we begin to approach the really decisive questions as to the true data of theology. These used to be found in a body of statements believed to be inerrant and removed completely beyond criticism, as being supposedly stamped with the full guarantee of God Himself. These were contained either in the Bible or in Church tradition (especially, though not exclusively, in the Church's authoritative definitions) or in some combination of the two. The whole view rested on the assumption that revelation is strictly propositional in character. A "proof-text" was quoted, and it was held that "God has said" whatever was there asserted. But all our most influential theologians—not least those of Anglo-Catholicism, the most traditional and dogmatic section of the Church of England—now either expressly maintain or at least admit that the method of revelation is radically different from this. The grounds for this change of view cannot here be examined. It rests principally on modern Biblical criticism; but the full force of the argument can only be appreciated if this is taken in conjunction with comparative religion, the critical history of the movement of human thought in general, and the modern scientific conception

* It must be understood that the religious knowledge of God is "knowledge of acquaintance," comparable to that which we have of our human friends; not "knowledge about," comparable to the knowledge of things attainable through positive science.

of the universe, including particularly the doctrine of evolution. At any rate it is held by those who may be classed as modern-minded theologians that nothing can be finally settled merely by adducing a "proof-text" or even a number of "proof-texts." And, if this is true of texts from the Bible itself, *a fortiori* no final and indisputable authority can attach to a "proof-text" from any œcumenical definition or from any catena of reputedly orthodox theologians.

Unfortunately, when it began to be widely accepted that the original data of theology are not to be found in a body of given and uncriticizable propositions, too many fell back, all too hastily, as an apparently easy way out, on the attractive view, which seemed to stare them in the face, that its data consist of "religious experience." But this is only true in the same sense as it is true that the data of astronomy consist in astronomical experience, or those of chemistry in chemical experience; at least, in so far as there is any difference between the cases it is a minor and subtle one, which we shall have occasion to notice in a moment. It is true of course that astronomical or chemical phenomena must enter into conscious experience before they can become data for science. But no one ever thinks of characterizing the data of these sciences in this way. That they must be consciously apprehended is taken for granted; what is insisted on is the phenomena regarded as objective facts. For such they are even for the philosophical idealist (since no one can really be mad enough to be a serious and convinced solipsist). Similarly, if the data of theology may be truly described as "experiences," it is not some particular strain of experience, valuable for its specific quality considered as subjective experience, that is in question, but experiences of a particular class of objective facts. The true data of theology are the facts of God's dealings with man with a view to making Himself known to him and uniting him to Himself—in other words, the redemptive and revelatory "acts of God" in history. If God does not reveal Himself by telling us, in so many words, truths about Himself, it would seem to remain that, if He is in any real sense to reveal Himself at all, He must do so by shewing in action what He is. But of course it is not all acts of God which fall within the purview of theology. If we believe in the immanence of God, the whole world-process might be regarded as one great act of His. Still more must we recognize more special acts of God in the advance of knowledge in all its branches, of social and political institutions, of civilization in the widest sense. But theology concentrates on His acts done in the direct interests of the salvation of men's souls—in other words, on His redemptive acts. Since it is specifically in these that He (in the religious

sense of the word) reveals Himself, they are also revelatory acts. Redemption and revelation are simply two names for one and the same series of acts (or process of Divine activity, if we prefer that expression), the one or the other being used according to the particular aspect of it, of which we are at the moment thinking.

The facts, or rather their bare skeleton which alone can be matter of pure historical evidence, must be established from the records, treated with complete candour according to the accepted methods of critical historians. Then these must be fully evaluated, and accurately characterized, from the religious standpoint. They must be analyzed, and their necessary implications for religious faith drawn out. Whatever is really involved in them may then be claimed to be validly established. But this, it may fairly be said, is the only way in which doctrines can in these days be "proved"; that well-worn term has radically changed its meaning since the time of *Pearson on the Creed*—nay, even since that of *Browne on the XXXIX Articles*.

But throughout this process other faculties are involved than the purely intellectual power required in the positive sciences. Even to recognize a given happening as an "act of God" at all needs spiritual discernment, and particularly a readiness to look *trustfully* to God—in other words, faith. Still more is this necessary to any measure of success in correctly interpreting admitted acts of God. In some measure indeed something similar to this is involved in art. There a special vividness of certain classes of sensuous perceptions and of emotions is needed even more than intellectual strength. But in theology, not only is a certain other class of feelings indispensable, but above all a certain bent of will. In science and art alike will is only involved to the extent of exercising a sufficient measure of attention to the particular subject-matter in question. But in religious thought an all-round disposition of will in regard to the whole of life—in short, a heart (broadly speaking) right with God—is indispensable. "If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." To that extent it is true that, *Pectus facit theologum*. There is therefore a great and important difference, in regard to the particular mode of the necessary apprehension of the data in consciousness, between theology and the sciences generally. Just to that extent there is some excuse for the exaggerated insistence on "experience" so popular today.

But if the above is an even approximately true account of the matter, then modern theology is in the case in which Hurrell Froude held that the Reformation stood—that of a limb badly set, which must be broken again before it can be reset. For by

far the greater part of it is deeply infected with the notion that theology is specifically, and above all, concerned with "religious experience." Thus the modernizing trend in theology, as a whole, has a most dangerous bias towards subjectivism. This is seen in its most extreme form in thorough-going Humanism, so far as that retains some sympathy with religion.* This system, of course, does not even profess to be Christian and avowedly does not believe in a God (unless possibly "in a Pickwickian sense"). It regards religious dogmas as simply and solely symbolic expressions of subjective religious experience possessing no relation whatever to any objective reality. But as such it holds them to be, in the main, "true," and allows that the experience in question is of considerable value. Of course, this extreme subjectivism could not be approved by any Christian theologian. But expensive hostages have been conceded to it by the *fidéo-symboliste* school, represented by the two Sabatiers. They, of course, believe in God as an objective reality, though they may be regrettably vague as to His personality. But, in spite of this, they do not really regard dogmas as being at all concerned to affirm anything about God and His methods and principles of action. They insist repeatedly that they possess truth only as descriptions of our subjective experience.

Much the same result follows from an excessive dwelling on "values" as being peculiarly the inmost stuff of religion. To affirm that this is good, or this is better than that, is, in itself, no more than to affirm a preference of my own. This is no doubt something more than a mere liking; it is understood to be of the nature of what we commonly call a "moral preference." Still it does not necessarily carry (consciously, and explicitly, that is) an objective reference. No doubt, when any theologian speaks of values, he does definitely mean that these are, in some sense, affirmed by ultimate reality; that the universe is, so to say, organized on their side. But it is often doubtful, to say the least, whether he thinks of them as affirmed and willed by the full force of the mind of a God at least (to say no more) as truly and fully personal as ourselves. The point of view is exhibited curiously in M. le Roy's work, *What is a Dogma?* There he insists repeatedly and emphatically that every dogma must be regarded solely as a precept enjoining a certain moral attitude. Whether that attitude implies any (or if so, what) affirmation about objective reality is, he argues, totally irrelevant to the "truth" of the dogma. No doubt to M. le Roy it seemed obvious that the attitude could not be ultimately justified apart from some assumption as to the character of reality. But, so far from arguing to this implication, he is at

* *Cf.* Lippmann, *Theory of Morals*, passim.

all pains to exclude expressly from the scope of the dogma any such objective reference. The soundness of his own faith need not be for a moment questioned; but on the precise shewing of his carefully worded exposition, one who is fully persuaded intellectually of the truth of pure-and-simple Naturalism could be a completely orthodox Catholic if only he were persuaded that Catholicism is morally edifying.

As against all such speculations, it is glaringly obvious that theological dogmas do at any rate intend and claim to tell us about objective reality. How far they succeed in this is another question. But we are not likely to be very successful in converting the world, unless we are fully persuaded that, broadly and substantially, they do convey to us real truths about God and His ways. No doubt their truth is only approximate and (much of it, at least) akin rather to that of poetry than to that of science. And this means that they contain a large symbolic element. But this is a matter of adumbrating, as adequately as possible, through the instrumentality of symbols, the truth about objective Being; that is a totally different thing from merely expressing in symbolic imagery our own inward experiences, as the *fidéo-symboliste* maintains. For instance, we cannot seriously profess to accept the doctrine of the Trinity if we hold this to be merely a way in which we find it convenient or edifying to imagine a God who may actually be no more like the Christian Trinity than is the God of old-fashioned Deism. There really is—we must suppose—a certain threefoldness in the inner being of God; He truly and eternally is all that the names Father, Word, and Holy Spirit convey to us; these are not (in Sabellian fashion) mere disguises which He chooses to assume temporarily, as an actor plays a part on the stage. But in what degree, or after what exact fashion, the "Persons" (admittedly used in a special, technical sense) are distinct—in particular, whether there is (as many would maintain) "mutuality of contemplation, mutuality of love" between the Persons of the immanent Trinity—are further questions, on which there may be legitimate differences of opinion. If to affirm this is to interpret the doctrine "symbolically," at any rate we must be careful to understand that term rightly, and distinguish our position strongly from that of modern subjectivism.

We must get back to the fact, to the "act of God." And while these redemptive acts of God cannot be confined to any particular line of religious tradition, the Christian must needs see, in that series of them recorded in the Old and New Testaments, so emphatically the main stream of God's saving activity that he can speak of it, without misgiving, as distinctively "Revelation" with a big R. The series or process, it must be

emphasized, is one and continuous. We have not to ask men to believe in a Christ who is simply left hanging in the air, and who would be equally convincing to us if He had somehow appeared suddenly out of the blue in Thibet in 600 B.C. or in Athens in the age of Pericles. There is an evident preparation for Him in the Old Testament story. A framework had been gradually built up, into which He would fit when He should appear; in particular, there is ample reason to think that He identified Himself with the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. But, of course, the earthly manifestation (including the Resurrection) of Jesus Christ constituted an entirely unique and supreme act of God "for us men and for our salvation." God has "visited and redeemed His people and has raised up a mighty salvation for us." The point is that Christ has done the great thing—the thing that has made all the difference. In particular, He has dealt decisively with human sin. There *is* an accomplished redemption—though its full fruits need to be individually appropriated through faith. That redemption is not indeed to be confined to the sacrifice of the death of Christ. It was wrought out through the whole life of obedience which culminated in that death; and is made available for our justification through His new risen life. Yet it reached its determinative crisis in the Cross; there we find the full meaning of the work of Christ more intensively expressed than at any other one point, and its power more evidently and efficaciously displayed. In this we should still be able to find "of sin the double cure," however exactly we may explain this—or even if we should find that we cannot completely explain it in any satisfying manner. It is capable of convincing us by its own inherent authority; as the late Dr. Forsyth well insisted, it is the Cross that is authoritative. It majestically commands the general conscience of mankind; and, doubtless, still the *best* conscience of the present day. Its centrality in the Gospel must inevitably be thrown up into higher relief than it ever has been since Wesley's time, just in proportion as the full bearings of Biblical criticism, with its destruction of the notion of a propositional revelation and its consequent throwing of all the emphasis into the Divine action, are taken in.

And that must carry with it the true Divinity of the Saviour. We believe in this—or at any rate we can most warrantably and securely believe in it today—because the entire life, death, and rising again of Jesus Christ impress us so forcibly, by their felt saving power, as being an undeniable and peculiarly direct act of God. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself"; He veritably, we find ourselves compelled to believe, lived within and acted through the humanity of Jesus. Clothing

Himself with this, He (faith is daring enough to say) stepped out, as we may put it, on to the stage of history as the principal actor in the world's greatest crisis. Questions may still remain as to the exact amount of importance to be attached to the precise phraseology of the Chalcedonian definition, or even to details in the Nicene Creed; but we may confidently affirm that Jesus Christ was (and is) true God from true God, and "as touching His Godhead" equal to the Father.

And the sense of enjoying "so great salvation" through the crucified and risen Saviour is, we find, inseparable, in the New Testament, from the consciousness of having been implanted into a body—"the mystical Body of Christ." If we recognize an act of God at all in the events recorded in the New Testament, then it is a sheer and unescapable matter of fact that the creation of the Christian Church (or, strictly speaking, its reconstitution out of the old Church-nation of Israel) was an integral part of that act. In that Church the first Christians were convinced that Jesus Christ was, in some sort, still incarnate on earth. It, they found in living experience, was filled by a Holy Spirit, which (or, whom) they unhesitatingly recognized as being truly the Spirit of Christ, and therewith as equally the Spirit of God Himself.

And it is undeniable that that Church has lived an historically continuous life ever since; and that, within it, countless faithful souls have enjoyed an experience closely corresponding to that of the New Testament Christians. Hence, the great redemptive act of God continues. Basing His present activity on the historical work of Jesus Christ, and applying to individuals the fruits of the redemption accomplished by Him, God still acts, as directly and supernaturally as ever, in saving the souls of men. And the analogy of the New Testament would naturally lead us to believe that He still acts in and through His Incarnate Son, Jesus Christ. There is nothing to suggest that there has been any break in the continuity of His risen life. It is only reasonable to assume that the God-man Jesus Christ is, in the fullness of His Divine manhood, still directly and personally active in this saving activity of God.

This activity is no doubt normal and constant in the life of the Church and in the experience of all faithful Christians. God's personal influence, which we call "grace," is doubtless ever available to be appropriated by faith. But this does not exclude special occasions, on and through which God and Christ peculiarly act. Such are the Sacraments, which have from the beginning played a large part in the Church's life. The activist and dynamic trend of the line of thought we have been following will incline us to regard their symbolism as one of actions *rather*

than of objects (it would probably be too much to say, "*and not* of objects"). And the same considerations must impel us to declare them to be not only symbols, but also, in some sort, instruments. If the Church is, as a spiritual fact, and not merely as an exaggerated figure of speech, the Body of Christ, can we hesitate to say that He, alive within His Church, does, in some quite real way, gather the lambs with His arm in Holy Baptism? And equally must we affirm that He (spiritually, but none the less really) makes the bread and wine of the Eucharist to be unto us His Body and Blood, for the strengthening and refreshing of our souls. The crucified and risen Saviour—ever near, and ever strong, to save—is the dominating fact of the Christian life. This splendid dynamism of the Gospel is what constitutes it both *Gospel* and *the Gospel*.

But if all this is true, why should we care to fall back on such pale ghosts as the "experiences" and "values" which modern subjectivism has taken to itself to be its gods? We are not worthy of our heritage unless our hearts are constantly exclaiming in grateful exultation, "What hath God wrought!"

N. E. EGERTON SWANN.

THE SEQUENCE OF THOUGHT IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES

F. C. BURKITT (*Church and Gnosis*, p. 19) writes: "The Paulinism expounded by theologians has for its basal axiom the notion that Paul had a closed system of thought, the same or nearly the same from soon after his conversion to the day of his death. This seems to me highly improbable. I think Paul was much influenced both by the mere lapse of time and by the greatness of his own work."

In one case, as Burkitt says—the question of the belief in the imminence of the Parousia—we know of a change. This was a matter which clearly loomed large in the imagination of the Thessalonians, to whom he wrote his earliest letters. They were expecting an immediate Second Coming, and this expectation was having a disturbing effect; and St. Paul writes to steady them (*cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 2). He tells them of indications and warnings in the shape of some sort of a concrete manifestation of the spirit of evil which was to precede the Great Day; but he seems to assume all through, as they did, that it would come in his own generation, and in 1 Cor. xv. 51, written two or three years later, he communicates to

the Corinthians a "mystery," that is a solemn secret, that all those who were alive would not die, though all would go through a mysterious change. It seems doubtful whether the words can be pressed so as to imply that he believed that he himself would be a living witness of the great event, as Burkitt assumes; but at all events they mean that some of his contemporaries would. On the other hand, when he writes to the Philippians, after a further interval of a few years, he certainly contemplates and earnestly desires his own death, as he does in 2 Tim. iv. 6-8, if that letter is accepted as coming from his hand; and the later epistles generally contemplate the establishment and draw out the theory of a Church which was to be no ephemeral institution, but was starting upon a career of indefinitely long duration.

Here we have a clear indication of a change in his eschatological outlook which, though it did not in itself involve any question of fundamental doctrinal importance, nevertheless carried with it a great change in the practical outlook on life. St. Paul's literary activity extended over ten or twelve years, and as those years went on and no catastrophic manifestation of the spirit of evil and no Second Advent occurred and the Crucifixion receded further into the distance, his strong and honest mind, pondering upon and facing the facts, gradually came to the conclusion that in this matter of the anticipation of what was to occur in the near future he had been mistaken. The result was that, as he had already burst the bonds of Jewish nationalism and thrown the promises of the Gospel open to the whole human race, he now transcended the outlook of his own generation and laid open before them the vista of a Christianity extending indefinitely forward into time. It is difficult to say which was the greater achievement. The first was the most dramatic. It is easy now to say that if St. Paul had failed, it seems possible that Christianity might only have survived as a Jewish sect, while in the second case the mere lapse of time would have been in itself enough to prove the error of the primitive eschatological expectation: but in those early days the idea of a Christianity with an indefinite extension in time must have been scarcely less of a revolution in thought than the idea of a Christianity with an indefinite extension throughout mankind.

But apart from this or any other instance of a change of mind which the intensive scrutiny of the epistles may lay bare, it is clear that a progressive evolution can be traced in the sequence of St. Paul's dominant preoccupations. This was the result, on the one hand, of the natural play of his powerful intellect and generous, expansive spirit upon the fundamental beliefs which he had first seized and on which he never lost

his hold. As time went on, he drew out more and more clearly the implications of his faith. On the other hand, the prominence of particular issues at different times was to a large extent determined by historical conditions and the difficulties and the needs of those with whom he had to do. There is no trace of any change of opinion on any point of fundamental doctrinal importance in the later epistles: what can be traced is a development proceeding partly from a growing realization of the implications of those first "elements" of his faith and partly from his own spiritual growth, and to some extent determined in the order of its sequence of ideas by the varying issues which his strenuous missionary activity forced into prominence one after the other.

The epistles may be conveniently divided into four groups which follow one another in chronological order, in each of which one characteristic issue is predominant, though not to the extent of precluding others equally important.

1. The two epistles to the Thessalonians, brief and comparatively inchoate.

2. Those which deal with the relation of Christianity to Judaism.

3. The Epistles of the Captivity, in which the question of the Person of Christ is the dominant issue.

4. Those in which antagonism to early Gnostic tendencies is apparent—especially Colossians.

1. The epistles to the Thessalonians are simple and straightforward. They assume that their readers are acquainted with, and have accepted without question, what may be described as an elementary gospel. They are entirely devoid of discussions of doctrinal questions, and are devoted to exhortations to the attainment and maintenance of a high standard of life and conduct worthy of their calling, and to steadfastness under inevitable troubles. They also contain expressions of heartfelt commendation. A large part of them is concerned with the burning question of the Parousia, which as time went on became less pressing and finally died out.

2. The first danger which the infant Church had to encounter was the hostility of the Jews. Historically Judaism was the mother of Christianity, and the mother set herself to destroy her offspring; the early chapters of the Acts are full of manifestations of this vindictive hatred, the same hatred which plays so large a part in the accounts in the Fourth Gospel of the personal antagonism of official Judaism to Christ. If the Jews had had their way all that would have been left of Christianity in the history of the world would have been the

record of one more deluded and disillusioned sect of Judaism. No doubt our Lord consistently represented the Gospel as the fulfilment of the Old Testament promises to Israel; but the fulfilment of the promises involved the initiation of a new order. The new covenant meant the abrogation of the old. The new wine could not be put into the old wineskins without bursting them. There was a disruptive leaven in the Gospel. The iron bands of Jewish nationalism, the most intensive the world has ever known and the most persistent, had to be broken if Christianity was ever to be an universal religion, and it was that or nothing. The intimations in the writings of the later prophets of the extension of the operation of the promises to cover the whole of mankind left the greater part of the Jews untouched. It was only here and there that they fell on fertile soil. St. Paul himself, a thorough-going Rabbi in his early days, learned in the Law, could form at first no idea of the new religion other than that it was something to be pursued with threatening and slaughter. He felt the full strength of the appeal which national feeling made to his countrymen. He was of the race of Israel and of the tribe of Benjamin, the Hebrew son of Hebrew parents, a Pharisee as far as the law went and a vehement persecutor (Phil. iii. 5; *cf.* Rom. xi. 1 and 2 Cor. xi. 22). He knew what it meant to have sat at the feet of Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3). But after his eyes were opened he felt the full force of the new swing of the pendulum away from the Law towards freedom and grace, and his Gospel was a gospel of deliverance (*cf.* Galatians *passim*). In the fulness of time the world had attained its majority. No words were too strong to express the contrast between the old state and the new. To rely upon the works of the Law was to remain under a curse (Gal. iii. 10). To be a Christian meant to stand fast in a new-found freedom (Gal. v. 1).

But to official Judaism, St Paul appeared to be nothing but a deluded rebel of a particularly pestilent sort. Their cry was, "Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live" (Acts xxii. 22). It was war to the knife between him and them personally, and between what he believed and what they taught. They gave no quarter, and he was well aware that he was engaged in a mortal combat on a vital issue. If what they taught was true, what he believed was a vain imagination. But his own faith was so strong that he believed that he held a divine commission to proclaim it to the whole world, and for this faith he was ready to fight and, if necessary, to die. He bore a life consecrated to a particular object: he had received a charge which he could only neglect at his peril (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 17; 1 Tim. i. 11; 1 Cor. ix. 16). He

had no choice. Necessity was laid upon him. He must have been well aware from the very first that if his commission was to be carried out, he would be plunged at once into a desperate contest with enemies who were not particular about the weapons which they used. He could not get far with the proclamation of the simple gospel of redemption through Christ without first settling his accounts with those who either rejected it altogether or sought to confine its benefits to the chosen nation.

The first phase in the carrying out of his commission, after his emergence from the three years' retirement into "Arabia" which followed his conversion (Gal. i. 17, 18), consisted in the proclamation of this simple gospel, primarily to the Jews of the Dispersion, incidentally and with growing emphasis to the Gentile world by which they were surrounded. He took it for granted from the very first that he had a special part to play. The issue was practically decided when he went off into Arabia instead of going up to Jerusalem "to see those who were apostles before him," which was the most obvious thing for him to do. There never was any doubt in his own mind. If any of the leaders took the opposite view that salvation was of the Jews alone, and consequently that Gentiles who became Christians must as far as possible be assimilated to Jews by the rite of circumcision and so brought under the yoke of the Law, he simply "withstood them to the face" (Gal. ii. 11). This uncompromising attitude he justified by the reiterated assertion that he had himself received a direct and independent revelation of what the Gospel meant and what he himself had to do. But independently of the controversy which at one time threatened to divide the infant Christian Church into two permanently opposing parties and which was ended by a compromise which served its purpose until the full implication of the Gospel became generally understood and accepted, the spirit of savage, uncontrolled hatred which had sent Christ to His death was still alive and active in Jerusalem and raised its head wherever he went in those early days of feverish conflicts between the old and the new. There were plenty of "vile fellows of the rabble" at the disposal of the local opposition in other places besides Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 5) whom they did not scruple to use, to say nothing of the "devout women of honourable estate and the chief men of the city" such as he encountered at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 50), who may have been content with less disreputable allies. At all events the picture which we have to form of those first years is one in which ceaseless unremitting conflict with strenuous, unscrupulous adversaries plays the chief part. It is not that St. Paul had no time to think: that active brain must have been cease-

lessly at work, assimilating his own spiritual experience, working out, partly by reasoning, partly by instinct, the implications of his fundamental faith, learning in the course of his kaleidoscopic, adventurous travels what human nature is capable of for good or for evil. But the first call which came upon him was the call for action, or if for thought, then for thought as the basis of immediate action. The time soon came when the volcanic forces of his inward growth broke out into ordered outward expression, and when the necessity arose for displaying his faith, or at all events certain dominant aspects of it, as a reasoned system in face of attacks upon it from the intellectual side; but at first the need was to act, to assert, to declare, rather than to think or to prove or to defend.

The great doctrinal epistles were the direct outgrowth of this early formative period. Galatians, "especially distinguished among St. Paul's letters by its unity of purpose" (Lightfoot, *Gal.*, p. 63), is a vehement apologetic reassertion of the autonomy and self-sufficiency of the Gospel, written while he was still in the thick of the conflict. The two letters to the Corinthians (as we have them), deal with a variety of subjects some of them of only ephemeral interest; but the question of the relation of the Law to the Gospel is still a living issue, and runs through them as an undertone. In Romans the issue has been practically decided, and the time has come for a mature, reasoned statement of the essential truths of the Gospel—the same truths which had been present to him from the beginning, but now developed into an orderly system. The implications of his primary beliefs had on the one hand become clearer to his own mind, and on the other were on that account more susceptible of statement in a form which made them communicable to others.

No doubt, as the reviewer of Mr. J. S. Stewart's *A Man in Christ* in the *Times Literary Supplement* (June 27, 1935) well said, St. Paul has suffered from "the repeated attempts of religious scholarship to reduce his flaming message to a speculative system." He was always, in Professor Deissmann's words, "not so much the great Christologos as the great Christophoros." None the less, what he did in these four letters had to be done, and had to be done at that particular time. He had to give a reason for the hope that was in him, and which had nerved his activities during those strenuous years. Judgment could not be allowed to go by default. It was no less necessary to make his beliefs secure against intellectual assaults than it had been to assert them vehemently in face of attacks of a more vulgar kind. And this had to be done, not merely as a reply to his own opponents, but (as he himself was probably

by this time beginning to see) for the benefit of the world at large and of all those who in time to come were to feel mystified at the proclamation of so gigantic and staggering a scheme of salvation.

3. This was the first round in the battle which the infant Church had to win unless it was to succumb. St. Paul was her protagonist, and Judaism was the enemy. Christianity came to the Jews in the form of the fulfilment of a promise for which they had been waiting all through their history, and when it came they either rejected the offer altogether or else so misinterpreted it that they conceived that it applied to none but themselves. Here was a question which had to be decided at the outset. Were the Rabbis right, or the idealists of the Old Testament scriptures who from time to time had had visions of a whole world embraced by the redemptive action of a merciful and loving Saviour ?

Then there came another stage. If Christianity was to be an universal religion, it was clear that much of the old system which had sufficed in the past to shelter and stimulate the development of the religion of the Hebrews regarded as the chosen race would have to be abandoned altogether or else so transmogrified as to be made consistent with a changed outlook. Leviticus and Deuteronomy would not do as the basis of the organization of a Christian Church, much less the Law as expounded by generations of Rabbis, who became more and more immersed in the elaboration of technical minutiæ. If the expectation of a Parousia in the near future was a mistake and the new religion seemed likely to have a long future before it (and this, as we have seen, is what St. Paul came by degrees to anticipate), it must have an organization capable of expansion to meet new needs, but securely based upon a clear conception of the relation between the New Covenant and the Old and of the meaning of the new freedom which had dawned upon the world. This is what St. Paul set himself to provide in certain of the letters belonging to the third group.

The necessity of organization of some sort must have been forced upon him from the beginning. The belief in the near approach of the Parousia had in itself a disturbing and settling influence, as can be seen from the two letters to the Thessalonians, and there are elementary questions of order which naturally present themselves to any new society and have to be settled if it is to be worthy of the name of a society and not to be a mere conglomeration of independent units. Sometimes an organized society is created by the imposition from above upon its constituent members of a more or less complete system of rules and regulations: in other cases the organization

is the result of internal growth, new elements appearing as they are evoked by new needs. The organization of the early Church was of the latter kind. We find in St. Paul's letters no elaborate system such as begins to appear in the next generation and took rapid shape in the early years of the second century: but we do find continual scattered references which make it clear that there was an organization which was in process of growth and which had passed before his death beyond the first elementary stage. If the Pastoral Epistles are accepted as coming from St. Paul's hand, they furnish conclusive evidence of this. They deal largely with questions of Church order, and presuppose something more than the existence of a collection of isolated decisions on particular points such as may be supposed to have formed the raw material of organization.

But in Ephesians and Philippians we find something more than this, something which is not concerned with details however important in themselves, but boldly faces the question of the fundamental character of the Church and lays the foundations on which the whole of the Catholic tradition has rested ever since. The general conception of the Church as the Body of Christ which we find here drawn out underlay the developments of the second century. "The central theme" of Ephesians "is that of the great catholic society, the renovated Israel, the Church of God" (Gore, *Eph.*, p. 46). The idea of unity underlies the whole. The Church is an articulate system, an organism composed of many members in vital union with the Head. The idea was not a new one to St. Paul. He had already used the analogy when writing to the Romans (Rom. xii. 4, 5) and to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xii. 12 ff.); but here he works out the conception of an ideal society, a living whole, a co-operative association of distinct and various elements animated and interfused with a life derived from its Head which penetrated intimately into every one of its constituent members so intimately that the individual Christian loses his individuality to refind it in Christ and the whole body is the visible expression of the life which sustains it. The idea of the Church in Ephesians is of something complete—not in the sense in which a machine or an intellectual system is complete, but in the sense in which a living being is complete, capable of growth and actually growing. It is an organism, not a mere organization: a body, not a mere corporation. It seemed to him that the inadequacy of a law of ordinances as the basis of the spiritual life had become manifest; such a law only led to an impossible position, it was a sort of *reductio ad absurdum*. On the one side was the high ideal; on the other the weak will. What was wanted to save mankind was not a new law of the same kind

as the old one, with the prospect of a similar failure, but a new law or principle of life and liberty, such that it should not only present an ideal, but also bestow power to realize it. This power was conferred by grace, and of grace Christ was the sole source. All those who received it entered into a vital union with Him, and, in virtue of their common participation, into a vital union with one another, and the interwoven units formed the Church, a body mystical in its essence, but outwardly manifested in a practical corporate unity of action and belief.

Philippians is a letter of a different kind. It is informal—chaotic, if you choose to call it so—and intensely personal. "It was not written to counteract doctrinal errors; it enforces no direct lessons of Church government; it lays down no dogmatic system; it is the spontaneous utterance of Christian love and gratitude" (Lightfoot, *Phil.*, p. 66 condensed). But for our present purpose, standing where it does in the series of St. Paul's epistles, it may be regarded as a proof that some sort of approximation to the ideal outlined in Ephesians was actually in process of achievement in some places. It could not have been written unless there had been already in existence at Philippi something of the spirit which breathes in that ideal and something of the organized unity which served to give it formal expression. Compare it with the first letter to the Thessalonians, which also is characterized by a strong personal tone, and it will be found that it seems to presuppose a Christian society of a more advanced and stable type.

4. Lastly, we come to the group of epistles in which there appear to be clear references to certain tendencies of contemporary pagan thought which in the second century developed into elaborate systems of what we know as Gnosticism. This fact has been denied. Hort, for instance (*Judaic Christianity*, chs. 6 and 7), maintains that such words as Pleroma and Gnosis, which later had a technical sense, only bear an untechnical meaning in Colossians and the Pastoral Epistles—that there are no specifically Gnostic terms. If that were true, to suppose that St. Paul was ever concerned about Gnosticism would be to be guilty of an anachronism.

Now Burkitt may be right when he says that "the Gnostics come before us historically as Christians" (*Church and Gnosis*, p. 9), if he is speaking of the second-century Gnostics; but there is no reason why Gnostic tendencies should not have manifested themselves some time before they took systematic shape. Indeed, this is what we should expect, and this is the view which modern scholars seem inclined to take. The Gnosis is believed to have been a kind of philosophy derived from the Orient, not the product of Hellenic intellectualism, but falling

"under the great category of mystic religions which were so characteristic of the religious life of decadent antiquity" (W. Bousset in *Enc. Brit.*, *sub voce*). According to this view "the essential part of most of the conceptions of what we call Gnosticism was already in existence and fully developed before the rise of Christianity" (*ibid*). The second century was the flowering time of certain types of Oriental mysticism which had their origin far back in the past. Christianity found them in possession, and had a marked affinity with some characteristic features of these beliefs, such as the idea of a Redeemer and of the salvation of the individual. What happened in the second century was that the old Oriental beliefs were grafted upon a young, vigorous Christian stock, or (this is Burkitt's view), to put it the other way round, the young Christianity became fused with the old beliefs in an attempt to explain itself in terms of a modernized Oriental mysticism, and the fused elements broke out into systematic completeness.

Much light would have been thrown upon the matter if the writings of the early Gnostics had been preserved. We might have been able to trace a gradual growth with greater certainty. But even as it is there are facts which need a good deal of explaining away if we are to believe that there was no such thing as Gnosticism, in the broad sense of the word, in St. Paul's days. When we find that at one stage there is a frequent use in the epistles already mentioned of terms which admittedly had a technical meaning later on, and that at another stage, say twenty-five years later, represented by the Johannine writings, there are clear indications of the existence of characteristic Gnostic tenets, the conclusion seems inevitable that there was Gnosticism of a kind before the great Gnostics. Jerome's words, quoted by Lightfoot (*Epistles of St. John*, p. xxxiv), should be remembered: "Apostolis adhuc in sæculo superstitibus, adhuc apud Judæam Christi sanguine recenti, phantasma Domini corpus asserebatur."

Here is Docetism ready made.

Whether the term Gnosticism is to be reserved for the second-century developments seems to be a mere matter of convenience. The thing itself, the fusion of Christian belief with Oriental mysticism, is older than that; it must have begun in an elementary form as soon as the two came face to face, and the beginning of the process seems clearly traceable in St. Paul's last letters.

If it is true, as Burkitt maintains, that theologians have been in the habit of assuming that St. Paul's system of thought forms a whole which shows little or no sign of change from

soon after his conversion to the day of his death, that is no doubt partly to be accounted for by the rapidity with which speculation upon the Person of Christ developed even in the lifetime of many who had been His contemporaries. The historical sequence of ideas is thereby foreshortened and closed up, so that questions which were forced to the front in succession are thought of as arising simultaneously. This is a tendency which can be traced on a larger scale in theology as a whole. Systematic theologians who have before them a complete *corpus* of Christian doctrine which is the result of many centuries of concentrated reflexion are apt to think more of the logical connection of the different parts than of the processes of growth which have brought the whole of thought into its present form. But it is fatal to ignore history. All issues are not equally living issues at all times; each issue originates in response to some definite, historical impulse. They succeed one another, sometimes rapidly in periods of intense spiritual activity, sometimes at longer intervals; but they can never be fully understood except in relation to the circumstances which called them forth.

L. V. LESTER-GARLAND.

MISCELLANEA

OUR LORD'S TEMPTATION

MR. SYNGE'S dilemma is due to the fact that he has not perceived the distinction between desiring something *although* it is known to be wrong and desiring something *because* it is known to be wrong. Therein lies the cause of his difficulty. I would boldly assert that no one has ever desired something because he knows it to be wrong. The sinfulness of an action never attracted anyone: no one ever performed an action because it was sinful, when the action itself was abhorrent to him.

The boy who is tempted to take an apple is attracted by the apple (or, maybe, by the adventure of getting it) and not by the sinfulness of the action. His desire is instinctive and morally neutral; it is precisely the same desire as makes him take the apple his mother offers him after lunch.

"In feeling the desire," Mr. Synge writes, "to take the apple (which we ordinarily call being tempted) he has, in fact, sinned." In this there are two errors. First, the desire being instinctive and neutral, the boy has not sinned in feeling it. Secondly, temptation is not mere desire; temptation enters when mind and conscience begin to play their part and when desire persists *although* mind and conscience condemn the thing desired.

Our Lord was not "attracted towards an action that he knew to be wrong." He was attracted towards an action which was morally neutral. As soon as His mind particularized the desire and saw it in the setting of the particular circumstances, He perceived that the satisfaction of it in these circumstances was wrong, and rejected it.

Temptation is the persistence of a desire, in itself neutral, after the mind condemns it. The will has little control over the desire; it does control the satisfaction of it.

F. C. S.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE REFORMATION, THE MASS, AND THE PRIESTHOOD

SIR,

I am grateful to Dr. Cross for his detailed review of the first volume of my work. I plead guilty to having failed to notice a certain number of errors in the printing of names, etc., such as "Lollardry" and "Jenkyns." I tender my apologies to the learned Regius Professor for having thus misspelt his name. These, and any other errors, will be duly corrected in Volume II. Dr. Cross will hardly expect me to agree with all his criticisms. In particular, I cannot agree with his statement that the rubric about spiritual communion in the Anglican rite for the communion of the sick "is taken straight from the Sarum Manual." The *Manuale ad usum Sarum* directs that the priest shall ask: "Frater,

credis quod sacramentum quod tractatur in altari sub forma panis, est verum corpus et sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi?" The sick man replies "Credo," and is then given the sacred host, "nisi de vomitu vel alia irreverentia probabiliter timeatur, in quo casu dicat Sacerdos infirmo: 'Frater, in hoc casu sufficit tibi vera fides et bona voluntas: tantum crede, et manducasti.'" There is a world of difference between this and the direction in the Anglican rite, and it is simply misleading and inaccurate to say that the Anglican rubric "is taken straight from the Sarum Manual." As to the rubrics of the Roman Missal concerning the consecration of a second chalice in certain circumstances, this second chalice is to be treated as the Mass chalice—*i.e.*, the chalice of the Sacrifice—and there is no parallel between this and the provision in the Anglican rite for the consecrating of more wine *for communicants*.

As to my general method—*i.e.*, taking standard works as my basis, supplementing these where possible and necessary by my own researches—I admit, with Dr. Cross, that it would be preferable "to begin with the original documents and texts, and to consult modern writers afterwards." But an ordinary person like myself cannot possibly undertake such a study of history *ab initio* from original documents only. I consider it reasonable to take recognized authorities as guides, correcting where there is reason to suspect their accuracy. I am sorry Dr. Cross considers that my work is "not to be taken seriously by those who want history." I must derive what consolation I can from the fact that others have expressed a more favourable opinoin.

Yours faithfully,
ERNEST C. MESSENGER.

NORTH LODGE,
POLES,
WARE.

REVIEWS

THE WORKS OF ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS. Translated from the critical edition of P. Silverio de Santa Teresa, C.D., by E. Allison Peers, Vol. III. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 15s.

Professor Allison Peers is to be heartily congratulated on the completion of his laborious task. He has carried it out with all the clearness and thoroughness which we have learned to expect from him. The introductions are admirable, and the translation is in good nervous English, modern yet preserving the flavour of the original.

The earlier volumes brought home forcibly the need of such a critical edition as we have here. Commentators on St. John of the Cross had inserted passages into his writings which seriously affected his teaching. The saint's interest was centred in the Blessed Trinity, and he has comparatively little to say about the incarnate life of Christ. One writer has said paradoxically that, while St. John was thoroughly Christian in his devotion to Christ, in some ways he went beyond Christianity. It was this that shocked his early commentators, suspicious then of any taint of Quietism, so they introduced passages, redressing, as they thought, the balance and vindicating his orthodoxy. The new edition has omitted all such interpolations or reduced them to footnotes.

The volume under review, containing besides the Living Flame of Love, the letters and *obiter dicta* of the saint, other important material, shews how little St. John needed such clumsy champions. "Thou wilt not take from me, my God," he wrote, "that which once Thou gavest me in Thine only Son Jesus Christ, in whom Thou gavest me all that I desire." His whole work was, of course, addressed to practising Catholics and presupposed the Catholic Faith.

The last half of the book is in some ways the most interesting of all. The utmost care has been taken to include only the undoubtedly genuine work of the saint. David Lewis' translation of the 1703 edition (edited by Zimmerman 1912), for instance, gave 365 spiritual maxims—one for every day in the year—a suspiciously artificial number. All those sayings have been carefully sifted, some new letters published, and personal reminiscences by those who knew the saint.

These, together with Father Bruno's recent biography, reveal to us an unexpectedly vivid and attractive personality.

Every now and then we are brought back into the atmosphere of Ramon Lull and his *Book of the Lover and the Beloved.*

Here is one quite unlike the harsh ascetic men have thought St. John of the Cross to be. A man of few words, of stern self-discipline and heroic courage, it is true, but betraying again and again a tenderness and a whimsical humour. True, he spent most of the night in prayer or writing, he lived in abject poverty with great content, and rejoiced in the midst of excruciating pain, because it made him like his crucified Saviour. But the ascetic is also the lover of Nature who delights in the woods and the flowers, the poet enthralled with Beauty, and the lover of his fellow-men. There must have been a homeliness about one who at recreation spoke so delightfully that he "made all the others laugh and they loved to have him with them." Few men have put more strongly than he the claims of charity, "He that loves not his neighbour abhors God." Or again, after the persecution he suffered from his enemies he could write, "Where there is no love, put love and you will find love."

Nor was St. John merely the mystic living in abstraction from the world. Those who knew him found he had his share of practical gifts. He was a capable ruler. He had "a rare prudence and the gentlest way of government." Indeed, a large portion of his time was spent in positions of authority, managing the affairs of others.

The "Living Flame of Love," St. John's fourth and last treatise, occupies the first portion of this third volume. He wrote two versions of it. Both redactions are printed in full, and the second vindicated as genuine against Baruzi's attack on it.

Was St. John of the Cross writing for beginners or the more advanced, for "proficients"? The question has been often raised. Dom Chapman (whose *Spiritual Letters*, recently published, form an illuminating commentary on St. John's teaching) maintained that it was for the beginners. St. John himself said that he was writing for all those who were drawn towards contemplation, but he deliberately refused to deal with discursive prayer in his books. It would be truer to say that he had in mind neither specifically. He had learned something of the possibilities of life in union with God in the life of prayer and much of the road that led to it and of the difficulties to be encountered. These he set himself to declare and explain to the best of his ability. His writings were addressed to all those who had felt that mysterious inward urge of God and desired to respond to it. One might as well ask whether John Bunyan wrote his *Pilgrim's Progress* for saints or sinners.

Surely that is the best way to deal with the spiritual life.

The very title of his first work, *The Ascent of Mount Carmel*, sets an ideal before men, suggests an arduous climb and a summit to be attained. Walter Hilton adopted the same plan in his *Scale of Perfection*. So did the compiler of Father Baker's *Sancta Sophia*. They took into their purview the whole life. Too many modern writers have fallen short here. They have confined themselves to elementary stages and have had little to say about the rest, for fear of alarming beginners. That has meant not only failure to present such beginners with an adequate ideal, but also the turning of prayer into a kind of ascetic exercise—a method or an art—rather than a communion with God, possessing untold possibilities of progress. Even elementary prayer can look towards contemplation, pave the way for it. Some methods of meditation are almost blind alleys, preventing the development of a deeper, simpler prayer.

The subject of mystical prayer has an unhealthy fascination for some people. A study of St. John's four treatises would go far to cure that. Perhaps no other master of the spiritual life has sought so earnestly to explain, so far as explanation could be given, the essence of that prayer. Certainly no other brushed aside more ruthlessly its accidents—visions, revelations, trances. St. Teresa treated these with a robust commonsense, but they had a large place in her teaching. St. John went far beyond her in his minimizing of their value. His very method aided him here. The dry pertinacity of the scholastic, his meticulous enquiry into the meaning of each phrase, helped to purge the subject of its inevitable tendency to *Schwärmerei* and sentimentality. Yet at the same time the fact that the core of his teaching was given in four exquisite lyrics constantly reminded his readers that behind all lay the mystery of God. There is no better medium than poetry to convey that sense of mystery, of depths beyond.

When a man says he is no mystic he generally means he does not go into ecstasies in his prayer, nor are visions granted to him. It comes as a prodigious surprise to him to learn that such things have no essential connection with the subject. Mystical prayer, on the contrary, begins, St. John teaches, not only without such concomitants, but even by losing the ordinary lights and affections that are to be met with in the elementary ways of prayer. It is a darkness, not a vision. A painful sense of God's absence is as characteristic a mark of contemplation, at least at one stage, as a vivid sense of His presence.

HUBERT NORTHCOTT.

THE PARABLES IN THE LIGHT OF THEIR JEWISH BACKGROUND. By W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

I cannot help feeling that Dr. Oesterley would have written a more valuable work if he had concentrated more on the Jewish background of the parables of our Lord and given less space to his own interpretation of them. The difficulty of all attempts to interpret the Gospel parables is that they contain such a depth of spiritual meaning that by themselves they make an immediate appeal to the heart and mind of the reader; yet as soon as we try to expound them we find that our exposition is quite inadequate. Moreover, we are always tempted to read into them our own views on dogmatic theology; and although it is in a sense legitimate to interpret the parables in the light of the general principles of the Christian tradition, it is rarely possible to maintain that this interpretation was really intended by our Lord when He uttered them. Thus in the parables of the wise and foolish virgins and of the ten talents Dr. Oesterley introduces the relation of grace and free will. But surely the oil, which the wise virgins provide and the foolish fail to provide, is simply the treasure in heaven in the form of good works and righteousness which is indispensable for those who would enter into the kingdom of heaven, while the talents are the natural gifts which God entrusts to men to use for His glory.

Further, any attempt to deal with the parables as a whole demands a fuller consideration of the growth of the Gospel tradition than Dr. Oesterley is able to give within the limits of a book which was originally delivered as the Warburton lectures in Lincoln's Inn; it is hard to avoid the impression that in some cases the authenticity of particular details or of the apparent connection of thought or history has been decided on the basis of Dr. Oesterley's private opinion of what the meaning or connection ought to be, rather than on the critical probabilities. This is particularly obvious in the case of the Lucan parables; in St. Luke the parable of the sower makes all the seed sown on good ground bring forth a hundredfold, not "some thirty some sixty and some a hundredfold," while the parable of the servants entrusted with five, three and one talent respectively becomes a parable of ten servants each entrusted with one pound. The variation is at first sight peculiar; but it becomes obvious when we recognize that these parables have been altered because in their original form they might be claimed in support of the Gnostic view of three classes of mankind, the spiritual, the natural and the material. (*cf.* Hippolytus, *El.* v. 8). This is merely an instance of the kind of factor that has to be considered.

On the other hand, Dr. Oesterley has rendered a real service

in his use of Jewish writings to illustrate the parables of the Gospel. It is becoming increasingly clear that the meaning of the Gospel, and of the New Testament as a whole, is to be found more by a study of rabbinical Judaism, than by searching for parallels with Hellenistic cults or even Jewish apocalyptic. In this respect the modern school of Jewish theology represented by the late Israel Abrahams and C. G. Montefiore has done a great deal to correct the aberrancies of the dominant theology of the earlier years of this century. And it is of the utmost importance that Christian scholarship should take account of their work and also be in a position to check their results. Dr. Oesterley's book is a valuable contribution to the understanding of the Jewish background; it is especially commendable for the reason that it neither underrates the real spiritual values of rabbinical Judaism nor fails to assert the originality and the higher value of the teaching of our Lord.

There is a strange blunder on p. 43, n. 1, where we are told that "ever since the reign of Salome . . . the Sanhedrin was composed exclusively of Pharisees." No authority is given for the statement, which is obviously incompatible with the position of the house of Annas in the Gospels and the narrative of Acts.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP. Studies in its history and meaning by members of Mansfield College. Edited by Nathaniel Micklem. Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d.

To cover so wide a field as that of *Christian Worship* in a series of Biblical, historical and contemporary studies within 260 pages, by a variety of writers, is to court the dangers of scrappiness, overlapping and occasional irrelevance. Nor (must it be confessed) are those dangers wholly avoided. But the attempt is on many accounts a notable one. The volume is in some sense a memorial of the Jubilee of Mansfield College, Oxford, with which all the contributors have, or have had, some connection. It is significant that "a systematic study of Public Worship" should be chosen as the theme on such an occasion. It is an indication, from a representative and very strong band of Congregationalist scholars, of the growing sense of the importance of liturgy.

"The problem of Christian worship," Dr. Franks remarks truly in his essay, "is really a theological problem." Hence one welcomes throughout the book the recurring note of a return (possibly due in part to Barthian influence) to the majestic conception of God, of His "sole and original activity

in the work of our salvation, which is the very foundation of our Calvinism as it is of that Catholicism which is the Mother of all western Christianity" (the words are Dr. Micklem's). Here Catholic and Calvinist and Lutheran—"habere Deum est colere Deum"—are at one, and the omen is good. The Methodist or Evangelical Revival is accused, not unfairly, of having introduced the subjective stream, and to have sullied the pure waters of traditional Nonconformity therewith—and not of Nonconformity alone. The genius of Puritanism, another essayist claims, is worshipful, and the objective hymn of praise—metrical psalm or Watts' Christian adaptations—one of the typical fruits and customs of Protestant faith and worship.

It is natural for an Anglican reader, without disrespect to very much else of interest and value, to find in the later essays the most profitable pages. Their purpose is defined, in the Foreword, as being to "serve as an interpretation, and in this sense a vindication, of the common tradition of our Reformed Churches." That these should be set against a background not only (as we should expect) of Biblical studies (among which those of Dr. Manson and Professor Dodd stand out) but also of two chapters on Early and Mediæval Liturgies (by Dr. Bartlet and Principal Franks) is itself significant. Three chapters, on Luther, Zwingli and Calvin respectively, one on the Puritans follow, and then four "contemporary studies." The complete absence of any merely partisan note, and the calm and scholarly tone throughout, make the task of trying to understand differences the pleasanter.

Of these differences between "Church" and "Chapel" many on either side would take the use or refusal of a fixed form to be a matter of principle. This is shewn to be historically untrue. "Geneva had its service book," but the English Puritan was confronted with the Book of Common Prayer, to him "the incarnation of those relics of Catholicism which he most detested in the national church" (a trustworthy tribute to the book's essential nature!). The advantage of free prayer, despite its acknowledged dangers, is defended by Dr. K. L. Parry, as lying "in the essential nature of prayer as communion with God." Another essayist recognizes perhaps more fully its extreme difficulty as a medium for *common* prayer, and traces to it a main cause of the "fatal passivity" of many congregations. (Nor are Congregationalists alone in deploring that.) A further point is made by a quotation from Dr. Forsyth that a form so sympathetic as free prayer may demand the earlier conditions when a worshipping congregation was almost identical with the Church of believers.

The place given to preaching is again an obvious difference

between Catholic and Protestant. The reviewer feels that a satisfactory answer has scarcely been given to the real question, In what sense is preaching an act of worship? Certain kinds of preaching may *evoke* worship. But the pulpit should provide also instruction in faith and practice, exhortation, exposition, as well as preaching designed to convert the outsider. The distinctions are not clearly drawn, and too much reliance seems placed on the elusive phrase "The Word," used half mystically and with insufficient definition. In any case, it is emphasized that, at least for followers of Calvin, preaching was not intended as a substitute for the Sacraments. Dr. Whale gives an acute analysis of Calvin's difference in this matter from other Reformers. His desire (if imperfectly fulfilled) was for the Sunday morning service to follow the lines of the primitive Eucharist—an "Ante-Communion," containing the sermon, completed with a general weekly communion; differing therein from Zwingli, who was content with a Communion four times only a year, "an occasional confessional act." We should like to know how far there is in modern Congregationalism any movement towards the restoration of Calvin's ideal, essentially primitive, and the intention of the Prayer Book.

Finally, attention should be drawn to Dr. Micklem's concluding chapter on the Sacraments—a restatement, it is claimed, of Calvin's. The emphasis is everywhere on the Sacraments as *God's activity through the Church*. Baptism is God's act, "the sacrament of regeneration"; hence Infant Baptism is defended, for the children of the faithful, but as an act of God, not a mere dedication of the child on the part of the parents. Again, "in the Supper the sacrifice on Calvary is as it were extended into time and applied to the heart of each believer," and it is noteworthy that the "carrying of the bread and wine of the Communion to the sick" is commended, in apparent preference to a private celebration which accords less well with the corporate idea.

We are grateful for these essays as an attempt to discuss principles in the light of scholarship and history. It is by such analysis and common study of each other's ways that the different sections of Christendom may be drawn nearer.

HENRY DE CANDOLE.

NOTICES

NEW LIGHT ON HEBREW ORIGINS. By J. Garrow Duncan. S.P.C.K. 5s.

Though full of meat, this is a disappointingly uneven book to come from the pen of so distinguished an archæologist as Dr. Garrow Duncan. Examining it on the lines of "Documentary Criticism," one can easily see what has happened: the book is a composite work. First we have the basic D sections, begun by Duncan himself some years ago, but laid aside to await further inspiration. A clue to the date of this, we are afraid, much outdated section may be found in the list of "Books Consulted." Apart from two authors to which we shall refer later, the list contains seventeen books, of which at least ten are over thirty years old, and almost all have been superseded by the amazing new discoveries of post-War Biblical archæology. To give but two examples—(1) it is depressing to find the old theories about the date of the Exodus (pp. 180-189) restated without any reference at all to the shattering arguments in Jack's *Date of Exodus* (1925), which have profoundly influenced all recent scholarship; and (2) it is strange to find the old identification of Lachish with Tell el Hesy maintained (apart from an obviously perfunctory gloss) in the face of Garstang and the recent epoch-making (but here ignored) discoveries at Tell Duweir.

More interesting are the W and Y insertions by a later hand. The W insertions consist of large excerpts from Woolley's account of his excavations at Ur of the Chaldees, though without any attempt to reconcile the dates where W conflicts with the D document. Abraham, for instance, is dated 2000 B.C. (W) on p. 66, though on p. 74 he is still dated 1815 B.C. (D). And there is a very strange absence of all reference to Abraham's contemporary Amraphel (Hammurabi?), upon which so much depends. Woolley's theories are here accepted as "assured results" of modern archæology. "It is a great comfort," writes the author, "to know that Abraham must have been sufficiently well educated to know how to extract a square or cube root!"

More uncritical still is the standpoint of the Y insertions, which are conveyed bodily and unhesitatingly from Yahuda's monumental (but perhaps not *aere perennius*) plea for an Egyptian origin of the Pentateuch. Many of Yahuda's picturesque footnotes to the Bible story were certainly worth reprinting in English (see his *Accuracy of the Bible*, 1934), but his deductions should not (in our opinion) be unloaded on the general reader without a caveat. It is misleading, in view of Langdon's *Sumerian Epic of Paradise*, to be told (p. 44) that "the story of Eden has no parallel in Babylonian," or "There is no doubt whatever that the garden was an oasis" (p. 45). It is a pity that so much good meat should be mixed with so much gristle.

STEPHEN L. CAIGER.

PROPHET AND PRIEST IN OLD ISRAEL. By A. C. Welch. S.C.M. 4s. 6d.

Dr. Welch is somewhat of an *enfant terrible* among Biblical scholars, asking artless but awkward questions, and quite unabashed in the presence of the most "assured result of criticism." As everyone knows, he has ventured to reopen even the discussion on Deuteronomy, and, fighting

the critics with their own weapons, to assault the very citadel of "orthodoxy." Nor, as he here somewhat plaintively remarks, has his argument "yet received a better answer than the obvious and inept remark that its position has not yet been accepted by the majority of scholars."

In the present volume he tilts at another "orthodox" position of modern scholarship—namely: (1) That the Hebrew cult practices (sacrifice, feast, ritual, etc.) were not native to the Chosen People, but were merely a pagan contamination caught from the Canaanites at the Conquest; (2) that the Prophets of Israel, realizing this, strove hard as against the Priesthood to abolish the cult-system altogether in favour of a purely "spiritual" and unsacramental religion; and (3) that the wholesale adoption of elaborate ritual at the time of the rebuilding of the Temple was actually a recidivist and final reaction against the whole of the Prophetic position. In other words, the Prophets are supposed to have been always fundamentally agin' the Priests, and in the end, after a brief glimpse of victory in the eighth and seventh centuries, to have been stricken dumb by the success of Ezra's legalistic and exclusive institutionalism.

Dr. Welch here makes a timely (in our opinion) protest against this facile rationalization of the development of Hebrew religion. As regards (1), it is extremely difficult, as the writer points out, to disentangle what is original and what is secondary or imitative in the Hebrew cult as described for us in the Pentateuch, but there are indications that several of the most important rites (*e.g.*, sacrifice) date back far beyond the Conquest to the Egyptian sojourn itself. Conversely, there were many Canaanite rites and high places which were never adopted by the invaders. As to (2), a careful examination of the clues seems to lead to the deduction that the ancient rites, though preserved intact, were gradually associated with a "form" or rubric of increasing spirituality, and that this process was guided by the Prophets *not in opposition to, but in co-operation with the Priests*.

This is a book which will appeal to such Catholic-minded readers as care about bringing the Old Testament within their scheme of Revelation. The Prophets of Israel, despite a stray oracle here and there, were *not* irreconcilably opposed to the sacramental view of religion. They hated feasts and sacrifices and solemn assemblies only when or if they were to serve as *substitutes* for obedience and sincerity of heart. After all (and Dr. Welch might perhaps have insisted more strongly on this point), the critics themselves declare that it was the *Prophets* who wrote down for us the JE stories of the Pentateuch, with their constant insistence on sacrifice and ritual. The fact that the Prophetical Schools preserved, for instance, the episode of Jacob's pillar seems to prove not only that they believed in ritual, but that they recognized the doctrine of development which would ultimately forbid what to Jacob was legitimate.

Conversely this little book proves what we would all wish to believe, that the Priests of Jewry were by no means hide-bound obscurantists, nor inveterately opposed to new light from Men of Vision. The sacraments they celebrated were vessels ordained by God, but they were vessels large enough to receive more and more of any fresh significance He might pour into them. Thus hand in hand the Ministry of the Word and of the Sacraments moved with the times towards the distant bourn of Bethlehem.

Dr. Welch illuminates his theme by frequent reference to modern parallels, and to his own experience as minister of a Scottish congregation. Incidentally, the book is a strong plea for "the outward and visible sign." "Acts of faith," as he calls them, "which a man would never have performed except at the bidding of his faith, are no mere formalities or insignificant accretions. . . . They constitute an active religion, and without them the religion of a community or nation cannot exist." Altogether an interesting and valuable footnote to the History of Religion.

STEPHEN L. CAIGER.

HANDBUCH ZUM ALTEN TESTAMENT: DIE ZWOLF KLEINEN PROPHETEN. Part I. Hosea to Nahum. By T. H. Robinson. J. C. B. Mohr (Tübingen). M.6.60.

The Minor Prophets in this series are being shared by T. H. Robinson and Friedrich Horst. Practically all the first part is written by the former, whose work, so familiar to the English reader, it is a great pleasure to see in a German dress. The special features of the Commentary are a German translation (so far as the text permits of translation at all—a difficulty which is frankly faced); brief critical notes on the Hebrew; exposition of the individual sections, with brief indications of the poetical structure. To the reader who has not kept up with recent developments the extreme shortness of the sections will come as a surprise. For the most part the prophets are now thought to be collections of brief oracles uttered by leading personalities, to which "many like words" were added by later editors. The task of commentators is in a measure made easier. Literary connection between the passages need not be sought. The value of the books as spontaneous outpourings of a nation's soul is enhanced.

It would be impertinent to say that the work is well done.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

ST. MARK'S GOSPEL: TWO STAGES OF ITS MAKING. By J. M. C. Crum. Heffer. 6s.

The thesis here presented is that there were two Marks: I., a simple story told by one very near to the events; II., a theological rewriting which had for its sources Mark I., Q, the Septuagint, and the traditions of the Church, and gave a mystical interpretation for the benefit of the Roman Christians of the seventh decade. The book is in some ways a model of critical method: beauty of style, keen spiritual perception, and a sense of devotional values, adorn every page. *But is it true?* There is a remote chance that this particular theory is right, but surely it is no more than remote. A few illustrations of the method will enable readers to judge for themselves.

The story of Gethsemane is analyzed thus. [Mark I.] "... Couldest thou not watch one hour?" [Mark II.] "Watch and pray ... the flesh is weak." [Mark I.] "And again he went away and prayed," [Mark II.] "saying the same words." [Mark I.] "And again he came ... very heavy." [Mark II.] "And they wist not what to answer him." [Mark I.] "And he" [Mark II.] "cometh the third time, and" [Mark I.] "saith unto them," [Mark I.] "Sleep on now ..."

Again, the question of the Sadducees in ch. xii. is a later insertion

into the original story, which apart from it has "a vitality with which it is not equally easy to credit the argument of the Sadducees about the seven brothers who married the one wife."

These seem to me admirable examples of the way in which a historical document should not be treated. Also the pages devoted to proving that "Son of Man" belongs to the later document and is not primitive have good precedents in theological books but are none the more acceptable on that account. When a phrase is, with one exception, found only in the words of Jesus, and never in the documents that reflect Church theology, it is perverse to say it must be an invention of the Church.

More pleasure and profit is derived from Canon Crum's speculations, which *may* after all be true, than from most men's repetition of truths. Perhaps the most typical passage in the book, both for its charm and for its reading into the text more than is there, is the description of the incident of the Syrophœnician woman as "the story of Jesus coming for the first time into contact with all that the 'Greek' genius, its sanity, its humanness, its quick clear wits, its friendliness (back to the Odyssey) for dogs; all that 'Greek' culture means to the civilized world today."

But the most apposite criticism is a reference to Dr. A. T. Cadoux's recent book on the same subject, which, with less charm but perhaps better technical equipment, applies the same methods to St. Mark and finds in it *three* unmistakable Gospels, a Palestinian one, a Gospel for Jews of the Dispersal, and a Gentile Gospel. The two books so completely cancel each other out that the ordinary student may be pardoned if he concludes that the learned authors are attempting the impossible.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Saint Paul: the Man and the Teacher. By C. A. Anderson Scott, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 5s.

An interesting study of the life and teaching of St. Paul, intended apparently for readers of some education, but with little acquaintance with the Bible. Nearly half the book consists of selected extracts from Acts and Epistles. The remainder is a marvel of compression, leaving us spell bound, but "asking for more." *E.g.*, "hypocrites" in the New Testament are not *consciously* so in the modern sense, but *blind*; saints are those who "belong to God"; Paul was "primarily an apostle, a missionary, not a dogmatic theologian"—his "pastor-consciousness" was something new in history. There are three main factors in his thought, history (the life of Jesus Christ), experience, and inspiration, which does not connote infallibility, but rather suggests intuition. The "Wrath of God" is not to be taken literally, but means His "eternal reaction against evil." (Does Dr. Scott believe that evil is eternal, or that human wrath is never entirely righteous?) "Sin" is sometimes, but not often, used by St. Paul in the modern sense; it is usually conceived as an external force, hostile to God and Man. Predestination is not regarded as opposed to free will (the tension between the two seems hardly to have been felt in the ancient world). Dr. Scott criticizes "traditional" views on the Atonement rather unexpectedly on the grounds that the Temple-sacrifices had not bulked largely in the religious life of Judaism for some centuries before St. Paul's day, and that they had at no time even professed to deal with "presumptuous" sins. His own

view ("that the obedience of Christ supremely manifested on the Cross made it possible for God to forgive *a tonce* those who came to be united to Christ by faith"—"the death of Christ had made it possible for God to forgive sinners without undermining the moral order of the universe") seems to be that of Moberly, with a reminiscence of Dr. Dale.

J. H. McCubbin.

Tree Lore in the Bible. By Lonsdale Ragg, D.D. With 8 illustrations from pencil drawings by the Author. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The earliest treatise on dendrology was perhaps that written by King Solomon, unfortunately not extant. The great monarch prided himself on the trees he had planted, but they were all fruit trees! He appears to have done nothing to replace the terrific wastage of forest trees occasioned by the building of his magnificent Temple and palaces. The tragedy of civilization in many countries, such as China and Palestine, lies in the clearing of forests in the name of progress, with the result that in course of generations the soil, deprived of their protection, is washed away by storms and streams, and a barren waste is all that is left. Tree-lovers, like the author of this beautiful little book, do well to point out the practical value, as well as the beauty, of the forest giants. There are some interesting points connected with the mention of trees in the Scriptures. The Vine is selected by our Lord as a figure of Himself because it is treated so cruelly in order that it may bear its fruit. The Barren Fig-tree was cursed because its premature leaves gave promise of premature fruit—which was not there. The Lucan *parable* of the Barren Fig-tree shews our Lord to have been Himself a tree-lover. It is tempting, but erroneous, to identify Solomon's "Apples" with Jaffa Oranges, these having been introduced from Portugal in the Middle Ages.

J. H. McCubbin.

The Will to Freedom. By Ross Hoffman. Sheed and Ward. 3s. 6d.

This interestingly written book presents a point of view that deserves recognition by those who are studying the crucial issue involved in the relationship between Church, Community and State. The conclusion reached may be acceptable to very few, but the argument is forcibly presented and the criticism of present conditions in politics and economics is acute. Fascism, with which the writer has some sympathy, is fairly judged; but Marxism, which he regards as the greatest evil of our time, will be considered (by those who have taken Professor Macmurray as a trustworthy interpreter of Marx) to suffer serious misrepresentation. Dialectical materialism is a very different philosophy from the materialism of the last century. It is a repudiation of mechanism and an affirmation of organism. But misunderstanding of Marx is to be expected in one who, like Hitler and Mussolini, is influenced so powerfully by reaction against communism. But the author differs from these dictators in one important particular. They are both retrogressive: he is far more consistent and thoroughgoing in his retrogression. He wants to go back to Aquinas, back to St. Louis, back to the medieval State of which the "component elements are popular sovereignty, natural law, the social contract, the republic and the prince" (see p. 8 and also pp. 12,

97, 120, 135). The only hope today, as he sees matters, is for a dictatorship qualified by a social contract with the people. Whether this contract would be anything more than a revival of the fictitious contract of Hobbes, and whether there are any natural rights distinct from legal rights, and if so what they are, are questions that might well be discussed when this book is taken with others by groups discussing this whole subject.

Discussion will also be aroused by the contention that the Dictatorship must extend its authority over truth (p. 88) and over morals (p. 92). Those in this country who remember what Milton wrote concerning truth —"give her but room"—may well ponder these words: "Today there is no certainty at all that truth can overcome falsehood in an unrefereed fight. . . . A lie which has ten million dollars of vested cash behind it can make short shrift of the countering truth which has no cash at all" (p. 88).

It is clearly recognized that everything will depend upon the conscience of the monarch or executive (pp. 85, 133, 139). But it is better so than that everything should depend on the lack of conscience in a plutocracy. It is, however, the end of democracy and the representation of minorities. The minority who disagree with the policy of the dictatorship will not be destroyed, but they will be deprived of all rights and of all influence (p. 94). His antipathy to liberalism is almost as strong as his horror of communism. "Parliamentarism, having been the essential political method of liberalism, is necessarily involved in the breakdown of that political faith" (p. 16). He allows, however, the right of rebellion on the part of the people when the prince breaks the social contract on which his absolute authority ultimately rests.

In spite of this denunciation of liberalism, members of discussion groups might do well to read again Milton's *Areopagitica* and Mill's *Liberty* and *Representative Government*. There is a grave risk that our descendants may have to fight again for those very things for which our forefathers fought and died. The desire to retreat from the future and seek ambush in the past is significant of fear. And, the criticism of modern conditions notwithstanding, this book is out of touch with the world of today. The medieval state is a fantasy which has no relation to present realities. It is significant that the new authoritarian state here advocated is regarded as if it were an isolated social unit. There is no recognition of the existence of other states and no suspicion that in the modern world all policy is shaped by foreign policy. Even medieval monarchs were not always content to mind their own business.

CYRIL H. VALENTINE.

IN THE LIKENESS OF CHRIST. By Edward Leen. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

SONGS IN THE NIGHT. By a Poor Clare Colettine. Sheed and Ward. 6s.

THE LIVING SOURCE. By Paul Bussard. Sheed and Ward. 2s. 6d.

THE SCIENCE OF PRAYER. By Vincent McNabb. St. Dominic's Press. 5s.

These four books may fittingly be considered together.

In the Likeness of Christ is a sequel to Dr. Leen's *Progress through Mental Prayer*. It is a treatise on Christian Perfection, and is worthy

of careful reading. The writer attempts to teach the principles of the spiritual life not so much dogmatically as by suggestion, through a study of the psychological reactions of the Son of Man to His human environment. He aims at instructing people of good will to apply to their own lives practical lessons drawn from the Gospels.

Songs in the Night and *The Living Source* will delight many a reader. They are full of gems. "As you learn to love Beauty at its source," writes Bussard in his first chapter, "all the missing pieces will come to hand, and in the end you will have made a beautiful picture out of what was formerly only a puzzle." In *Songs in the Night* mystical experience is interpreted by means of solid theological knowledge and a profound acquaintance with the great mystical writers.

The Science of Prayer is a new and revised edition of Father McNabb's *Oxford Conferences on Prayer*. It is an attempt to provide a handbook of prayer useful not only to those in visible communion with the See of Peter, but to those "countless other souls, athirst for union with God." The author deals with "The Nature of Prayer," "The Divisions of Prayer," "The Theology of Prayer," "The Psychology of Prayer," "Vocal and Mental Prayer," "Liturgical Prayer," "The Prayer of Christ," and "Hindrances to Prayer." He gives some useful advice in regard to distractions.

H. S. Box.

L'Eglise et la Musique (Collection "La Vie chrétienne"). Par A. Gastoué. Paris, chez Bernard Grasset. 1936. N.p.

This is the sort of book it takes a Frenchman to write. It is full of learning: for M. Gastoué is a scholar of international repute who finds an honourable niche in "Grove" and has made contributions of the utmost importance to musical research. Yet the learning is worn with an ease and grace and gaiety that make his book a sheer delight to read. In the compass of some 200 pages he contrives to give, first, a comprehensive outline of the application of the musical art to Divine worship throughout the ages, at the same time scattering along his path a wealth of interesting out-of-the-way information. Specially delightful are two chapters on the use of musical instruments in church and on the popular element in Christian worship, represented particularly by the hymns and carols. Having completed his historical survey, the author devotes his two last chapters to an exposition of the true ideals of Church music, as laid down by Popes Pius X. and Pius XI., and to the elaboration of plans for making the prescriptions of those pontiffs practically effective. *Mutatis mutandis*, the Anglican worker in the same field will find not a little that is inspiring and suggestive in these chapters. He will learn that in the reform of ecclesiastical music the Roman Church has much the same difficulties to contend with as our own—musical ignorance of the clergy, prejudice of the laity, the defence of bad music on the ground that "people like it," the "tyranny of the organ," and so on. But he will also learn that in the one communion as in the other there is a powerful and growing movement in favour of better things—a movement inspired in both cases by principles that have been consecrated by the agelong tradition of Christian worship, however much in certain periods of debased spirituality they may have been ignored or defied.

C. S. Phillips.

APOLOGETICS FOR THE PULPIT. VOL. II. THE CHURCH. By Aloysius Roche. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s.

Father Roche, who is not the author of the *Reasoned Prayers* to whom we are so deeply indebted, explains that these "Apologetics" were not intended for the controversialist or for the student, but "for the ordinary priest looking around for points." The "Apologetics," however, are calculated to evoke from the controversialist retorts of a kind not unlike the "points." Yet, as no one is concerned to defend Henry VIII., no good could be done by retorting that the Pope who excommunicated that King was himself the father of two illegitimate children, or by setting the extermination of Protestants under Louis XIV. to outbalance the oppression of Romish recusants in seventeenth and eighteenth century England. On p. 143 the author suggests that the "Massacre of St. Bartholomew" is a "fiction agreed upon." What good can be done by such a suggestion? A solemn thanksgiving was held at Rome, and a Papal medal struck to commemorate the event, and the French Queen wrote to our Elizabeth to assure her that if she was disposed to deal with her Romish subjects in the same way she would receive no hindrance from France. Why should our author be constrained to defend or minimize the event? Why resort to a theory of fictions? What real use can quotations from writers who regard Apostolic succession as a "figment" be to uphold the claim that the Roman Church has a valid priesthood which the English Church has not? Father Roche in the address on Freemasonry seems to imply that the English Grand Master (the Duke of Connaught) is either ignorant of what true Masonry is, or else is engaged in a conspiracy against Church and State—an occupation he would share with His Majesty the King and his Royal brothers! Father Roche is a past-master in the art of getting much *raw* material within the allotted space. Beginnings which capture attention and conclusions which bring home the points and the brevity make these addresses models of popular expositions.

WALTER K. FIRMINGER.

BOOK NOTES

Cardinal Manning. By Sidney Dark. Duckworth. 2s. This addition to the "Great Lives" series is a timely counterpoise to the impression made by Lytton Strachey's sketch in *Eminent Victorians*. It lays a good deal of stress on the part played by Manning in Labour politics.

Friendship—Love in Adolescence. By N. M. Iovetz-Tereshchenko. Allen and Unwin. 16s. A quite extraordinary book, which at great length prints the diary of a Russian boy from thirteen to sixteen years old, adding comments and other evidence. The footnotes would seem to some overdone even in an edition of a new Gospel fragment. Continually we read: "no new paragraph in the original," "full-stop in the original," "the word begins with a capital in the original," etc. The thesis is that the affection shewn towards schoolgirls in the original is not sexual. "Love is not a sexual phenomenon . . . there are *two different* factors working in man—the Sexual and Love." Parish priests

would probably find little to help them in this book. That many boys love girls with purity, shyness, and reverence is well known; but such love is not on that account non-sexual. To specialists the book is doubtless valuable.

A Young Man's Religion. By G. Stuart Worsley, A.L.C.D., C.F. S.P.C.K. Paper, 2s.; cloth, 3s. 6d. Excellent plain-spoken addresses supplying answers to the questions, not only of young men but of other thoughtful people, about religion. The answers are reverent and clear and from the present-day standpoint. They should help any reader to think things out for himself on right and sound lines. J. R. P.

Diversity in Holiness. R. H. J. Stewart, S.J. Sheed and Ward. 6s. A dozen sketches of the lives of officially canonized and unofficial saints of the Roman Communion (all but Mother Julian are of post-Reformation date) to illustrate the thesis that holiness is to be found in any and every variety of circumstance. Of some at least of the lesser-known—*e.g.*, St. Benedict Joseph Labre and the Holy Man of Tours—it is safest to say that they seem to require too much special pleading to minister greatly to edification. H. DE C.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher